

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Senator Humphrey Prepared for Delivery to the California Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the California Legislature extended to our colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] an invitation to address its membership on Friday, April 24, 1959. His speech was keenly awaited, and it was with genuine disappointment that the legislators received word that Senator HUMPHREY could not appear before them because of his hasty return to Washington for the Senate debate on the labor bill.

Senator HUMPHREY's remarks prepared for that occasion are a salute to our growing State, and call attention to California's increasing importance in the American scene. I believe that his text will interest Members of Congress and other readers of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, SACRAMENTO, APRIL 24

It is a pleasure to return to California.

Actually I—along with thousands of other Democrats—have plans to be out here in July, 1960—in Los Angeles, to be specific. But I find the magnetism of California irresistible, and, like many other Minnesotans who have been drawn to your State, I decided not to wait.

It is one of the greatest honors of my public life to appear before the California Legislature, and I am deeply grateful for your invitation.

As a fellow legislator, I can well appreciate the tremendous problems that face a legislative body in a dynamic and fast-growing State. Representative government finds its heart in legislatures, which most directly represent the people.

You and I know that the process of legislation is one of the most delicate and difficult in the art of government.

I am tremendously impressed, as are many millions of Americans, by the magnificent record Governor Brown has established in his first few months in office. He has faced up to what is obviously a serious fiscal problem, and with your cooperation and counsel, I am sure that together you will solve it. Surely Governor Brown will rank among the great Governors of the Golden State.

And I enthusiastically acknowledge to you here today, in common with many, many Americans, that the roster of great Governors of California—indeed, of great American leaders—carries the name of the present Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren.

You have given us many fine leaders and public servants in both political parties. We in the Senate welcome your capable and energetic new junior Senator, CLAIR ENGLE,

whose previous congressional experience has been recognized in his assignment to two major committees so vital to California's future—the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I might add, in a nonpartisan spirit, that I was pleased that our Republican colleagues have honored one of your former members, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, by making him assistant Republican leader in the U.S. Senate.

It has been my good fortune within the past few days to visit the States of Washington and Oregon. Very soon I shall stop off in Utah and Wyoming on my way back to Washington, D.C. But no trip to the West is complete—does not even begin, some might say—until one visits California.

To me California symbolizes America's future, her greatest hopes.

For California is a social cross section of the Nation. Here are gathered peoples of all races, religions, and origins, living together with a remarkable absence of strife or friction.

You have marked geographic diversity in your State—towering mountains and flat, fertile valleys; lakes and deserts.

You even have a North and a South, but happily you exhibit—to the visitor at least—no sign of civil war.

California's way of life is an example to the rest of America. Indeed the strength, vigor, and pioneering spirit which it represents is the answer to the repressiveness and deadness of spirit of the Soviet Union.

The answer to the Russian Bear is the Golden Bear of California.

You here in the West—and particularly in California—have cared about and mastered the problems of living with other people, respecting their opinions and traditions, fostering and taking pride in the diversity of your people. For this, you deserve the respect of the Nation and of the world. This is America at her finest.

Symbolic of this is the passage by this legislature, under the leadership of Governor Brown, of a measure to assure equal opportunity in employment for every person, be he rich or poor, black or white, Catholic, Protestant, or Jew. For this effort, I salute both you and Governor Brown.

I respect and admire your vitality and your eagerness to meet and solve problems. You seem unhampered by convention or shibboleth or by the doubters who so facetiously catalog the obstacles but seem incapable of devising the answers.

To me the doubters hold sway altogether too much in America today. Their appeal is to the timid and the cautious in us, not to the venturesome or the daring.

This Nation and this State face new problems, big and difficult problems very different from those we overcame in the past.

These problems will not be solved without looking ahead, without planning for the future.

For everyone except the Federal Government, planning is considered a virtue.

Parents plan for the education and security of their children.

Businessmen look ahead to plan new expansion, new products, to anticipate new conditions.

More and more localities have their planning commissions and staffs.

But at that point, the logic of planning seems, to many people, to come to an abrupt stop. Planning by the Federal Government seems tantamount to original sin. The same is true, to a degree, of planning by the States.

We will yield to such thinking only at our peril and to our future regret. For problems of the future will not solve themselves.

But I have faith in America's ability to solve them—and particularly in California's capacity to meet them.

For the spirit of California is still one of enterprise, of pioneering. Your continued growth is inevitable. Your material success is assured.

But I raise this question with you: How will you grow? How will America grow?

We can build the material things. Given proper leadership, we can reach levels of adequate housing for all, enough school buildings to house all our children, maximum development of natural resource potentials. Science and technology inevitably will make greater inroads on disease and untimely death, hunger, and intolerable living conditions. These will eventually be conquered through physical changes in the material conditions of life.

If we live in the grandest houses and attend the most modern schools, but still have not learned to live with each other, to respect differences of opinion, to honor intellectual attainments, we have built upon sand and not rock.

I speak, in short, for building on the inner qualities of our people—those qualities of mind and spirit that encourage man to live at peace and in harmony with himself and his brothers.

There is much unfinished business to take care of in this country. As we go about it, new issues will arise. The human enterprise never finally solves its problems, so long as it remains a going concern. Progress involves not merely the solution of old problems, but the discovery of new ones.

But even if we solved all our domestic problems, our troubles as a nation would not be over. The paradise of our domestic security, as a noted theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr, recently said, would still be suspended in a hell of global insecurity.

So, as we strive to put our house in order, let us not forget our neighbors in other lands. Our material accomplishments must not become ends in themselves, but the means to achieve the ideals we share with peoples elsewhere. Our goal must always be to bolster the faith of peoples everywhere in free institutions and the democratic way of life.

True Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce to the House that today members of the 1929 championship basketball team of Camden Catholic High School, Camden, N.J., are attending a reunion in Washington in celebration of their 30th anniversary.

These men have been fast friends throughout the years—all reside in the same general area of New Jersey where they lived during their high schools days and all are contributing to the general well-being of their community, State, and Nation by taking a real interest in community, State, and national affairs.

This group has maintained throughout the years a vital interest in their

alma mater and played a dominant role in the reestablishment of the athletic program at their high school in 1946 which has brought not only credit to the school but inestimable benefits to the students and the community at large.

The members are accompanied by three men who helped guide them in their youth and have been their warm personal friends during manhood. These men are Rev. Paul N. Fairbrother, formerly athletic director at Camden Catholic and presently pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Woodbury, N.J.; Elmer "Al" Hertzler, former basketball coach and now associated with the Army Engineers here in Washington, and Thomas Ryan, former baseball coach and now sports editor of the Camden Courier of Camden, N.J.

The members of the 1929 team, most of whom have joined in this reunion, are William "Pat" O'Brien, Wallace "Bud" Sheehan, Rev. Peter N. Budniak, Matthew Slapkowski, John Flood, Lawrence Crevey, John Bach, Joseph Lloyd, Joseph Sascovitz, J. Edward McGowan, Charles Woods, and William "Reds" O'Brien. The team managers were James Campbell and Harry Kelleher.

All of these men have, by their accomplishments in their respective fields of endeavor, been a credit to their school and community and have by their friendship and loyalty to each other through the years, demonstrated the great spirit and teamwork that carried them to championship heights in 1929.

Of such stuff is America built.

Section 318 Amendment Is Not Necessary for VHF Translators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF WASHINGTON

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 the Federal Communications Commission announced that it would proceed with the licensing of VHF television translator facilities, to enable many isolated communities throughout the country to receive satisfactory television at a reasonable cost, provided the Congress enacts two amendments to the Communications Act of 1934.

I wish to commend the Commission for taking, at long last, what appears generally to be a sensible approach to this problem.

By requesting amendments to the Communications Act, the Commission has tossed the ball to Congress, and I hope that Congress speedily will enact such statutory amendments as are necessary to permit the Commission to proceed.

The first amendment requested by the Commission would amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934. That section now prohibits the Commission from granting licenses to any facility which was constructed without first re-

ceiving a construction permit from the Commission. Without such an amendment, the Commission could not license the many hundred VHF translator facilities now in operation in most of the Western States.

The proposed amendment to section 319 is embodied in section 2 of H.R. 6471, a bill introduced by the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I fully support this amendment and hope that it is enacted well before the adjournment of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

The second amendment requested by the Federal Communications Commission applies to section 318 of the Communications Act. The language of the proposed amendment, as drafted by the Commission, is embodied in section 1 of H.R. 6471. I do not feel that this proposed amendment is necessary or desirable; in the proposed form it clearly is irrelevant to the VHF translator problem and goes far beyond it.

My views on the proposed amendment to section 318 are supported, I feel, by a recent exchange of correspondence I have had with the Federal Communications Commission. So that my colleagues in the House may be more fully informed on this issue I have set forth below my letter to the Commission of April 27 and the Commission's reply of May 6:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1959.

Mr. JOHN C. DOERFER,
Chairman, Federal Communications
Commission, New Post Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. DOERFER: I wish to take this opportunity to commend you and the other members of the Federal Communications Commission for your decision of April 13 to proceed with the licensing of VHF television translator stations upon the enactment by Congress of technical changes in the Communications Act of 1934.

From my reading of the public notice issued on April 14, I feel the Commission has taken a generally sensible approach to this somewhat difficult problem.

You certainly may count on my support in the House of Representatives for enactment of the requested amendment to section 319 of the Communications Act. As a matter of fact, a similar proposal was included as section 2 of my bill, H.R. 3737, which I introduced on January 29, 1959.

I am somewhat puzzled, however, by your request for an amendment to section 318 of the Communications Act. In that connection, I have two specific questions which I should appreciate having your answers to.

First, I should like to know why you feel that any amendment to section 318 is necessary. From what I can learn from reading your public notice and from talking with members of the staff, it is my understanding that you contemplate requirements for the operation of VHF translator stations which are essentially similar to your requirements for operation of UHF translators. The UHF translator rules were issued almost 3 years ago and under those regulations, I believe some 200 licenses have now been granted. If an amendment to section 318 was not necessary in the case of the UHF translators, it is difficult for me to understand why an amendment is necessary before VHF translator rules can be issued.

Second, assuming that some logical justification exists for amending section 318 at all,

I should like to ask if it is not true that the amendment you have proposed to Congress is considerably broader than is necessary to accommodate the proposed VHF translator operations. I have examined H.R. 6471 and S. 1741 which embody your proposed amendment. These bills, if enacted, would empower the Commission at its discretion to waive the statutory operator requirements for all broadcast stations. By waiving the existing statutory requirements for all broadcast stations, the proposed language goes far beyond the announced intention of achieving a technical amendment supposedly necessary to accommodate just the tiny VHF translators. In view of this, I should like to know if the Commission would have any objection to confining the proposed amendment solely to the operation of VHF translator stations.

Sincerely yours,

DON MAGNUSON,
Member of Congress.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1959.

HON. DON MAGNUSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MAGNUSON: Your letter of April 27, 1959, addressed to our chairman, John C. Doerfer, arrived during his absence from the city on official business.

We appreciate your commendation and support for the proposed amendments to sections 318 and 319 of our act in connection with extending VHF television service (47 U.S.C. 318, 319).

The Commission felt that it could appropriately authorize translator stations and probably also the booster stations without having an operator on duty, but that it would be advisable to remove any possible doubt on this point by appropriately amending section 318. Present section 318 was enacted in 1934 and has not been amended since. However, in the meantime there have been wide technological improvements in broadcast operations. In the Commission's judgment it is appropriate to amend section 318 to dispense with the statutory requirement of an operator in the broadcast services, letting rules and regulations provide for the varying requirements necessary to protect the public interest. Specifically we would prefer to have the amendment to section 318 broad and not confined solely to the operation of VHF translator stations, although we initiated it primarily for them.

We appreciate your interest in our efforts to solve these problems and hope if there is any further assistance we can render you will not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEL H. HYDE,
Acting Chairman.

Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, highlighting the recent graduation exercises at the University of Alaska was the presence of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Leo W. O'Brien, from Albany, N.Y., on which occasion the University of Alaska conferred upon

him an honorary degree of doctor of laws. This was done in recognition of the inspired, dedicated, and brilliant work of Representative O'BRIEN in support of the Alaska statehood bill during the 85th Congress. I wish to join in this expression of gratitude from the people of Alaska, and further take this opportunity of extending a hearty salute to the whole Congress for the passage of the statehood legislation which has reaffirmed the basic American principles upon which our great Union is founded. I also wish to make available to my colleagues the meaningful and significant message of LEO O'BRIEN in his address to the 1959 graduating class of the University of Alaska, as the thoughts so vividly expressed in that speech are pertinent to the problems with which the people of America are confronted and to the hopes and ideals for which we all stand. The text of the address of our distinguished colleague, Dr. LEO W. O'BRIEN, follows:

President Patty, members of the board of regents, distinguished guests, members of the class of 1959, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply moved by the great honor you have conferred upon me today, although I realize that in recognizing in this distinguished way the part played by two men in the creation of a new State you have also extended that recognition, in absentia, to many who had vital roles in this historic endeavor.

It is a signal honor, too, to be permitted to address the first college graduation class in the history of the State of Alaska.

You were only freshmen in the fall of 1955 when I paid my first—and until now my last visit to Alaska. I was then, as now, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs.

We came to Alaska to investigate the readiness of that great Territory for statehood. Many committees, through the years, had journeyed here on similar missions and, if some of those who greeted us in 1955 were a trifle bored or disillusioned, I did not and do not blame them. Only a few months before we arrived, the House had killed, by a margin of 48 votes, a bill granting statehood both to Hawaii and Alaska.

I have a confession to make. When I came to Congress in 1952, it was a matter of complete indifference to me whether Alaska would or would not become a State. I neither sought nor relished a place on the Interior Committee, dealing as it does with places farther from my home city, Albany, N.Y., than are London, or Paris, or Berlin.

How, then, did the congressional freshman of 1952, who thought only of an early escape to a committee dealing with problems closer to my district, become in 1958 the author and House floor manager of the bill which added the 49th star to our flag?

My first stir of interest in statehood came with the realization that, as chairman of a somewhat obscure committee in Congress, I, a man from Albany, had, in a sense, more power over your affairs than your elected Delegate and your elected legislature. And I had never seen this great land over which I had so much authority.

Then came resentment. Some of you may recall the famous fight over whether the Territory of Alaska should be given control over the treatment of its own mentally ill or whether we should continue a system of Federal control which smelled of the Dark Ages.

The issue seemed simple and those of us who fought for Alaska control over Alaska's mental health program believed we were

doing the right, the decent, the American thing.

But, from a dark depth in our national life I did not know existed, there came wild, excited cries of subversion and treason. The hate groups of our land joined forces and carried with them an army of the unthinking and the neurotic. I, who wanted only to help the unfortunate, found myself in the well of the House answering claims that we were part of a sinister plot to create in Alaska a million-acre concentration camp to which loyal people could be whisked in the dead of the night, no matter where they might reside.

Absurd? Yes. Childish? No. Many believed those things and the knowledge that they did, not only saddened me, but lighted a torch of anger which made me resolve that a Territory which could be attacked because it sought only simple justice should be rid of the shackles which led some to believe that Alaska was a colony populated by serfs and inferiors.

I shall not detain you with a repetition of the strategy which won the statehood battle. It all lies in the record for our children to read.

Rather, I should like to speak of the pride most Americans feel that the United States now reaches to the very border of Siberia and 2,000 miles out into the Pacific.

Why were our people so excited when we admitted the largest State in the Union and, later, the exotic place which is Hawaii? I think it was their realization that our feet were not cemented in the status quo and that the United States was not frozen into the past.

The responsibility of the other 48 States did not end when their representatives in Congress voted to add the 49th State.

When I and others pleaded with our colleagues last year to give Alaska the dignity of statehood, we said that the resulting economic benefits would flow through the entire Nation. We painted a glowing picture of things to come from the bowels of the great land.

But, this State is very new. Its rich resources will not pop from the earth and leap to market by themselves.

We have taken to us a new brother, but he must be helped as he struggles with the immense new problems of statehood.

But, I am very sure, that every ounce of help we give Alaska, financial, and otherwise, will be repaid in pounds or even tons. Alaska, in my considered judgment, will, in the lifetime of our children, be one of the greatest and richest States of them all.

I have talked so far of new geographical frontiers. My special message to these young men and women today has to do with the desperate need to establish a new frontier of the American mind.

A great scientist, such as Dr. Teller, and great educators, such as those who have brought you to this point in your desire to know, can give you facts by which you can walk toward fuller knowledge.

A politician, such as I, must deal with less solid things. His life, in large measure, has been spent in the observation of human moods and shifting sentiments. During that period of observation, which included 30 years as a political writer, I have come to the considered conclusion that the ugliest word in our language is mob.

Its employment raises unclean pictures in our minds, pictures of temporarily maddened men, with hatred and blood lust in their eyes, killing fellow men because of their color or creed, pictures of hypnotized throngs swaying to the frenzied words of a dictator or demagogue.

But I do not speak of those things today. I speak rather of mob thinking, of huge masses of our people bemused before tele-

vision sets buying their ideas as they would toilet soap.

I speak of mass fixations, the acceptance of unproven facts that all scientists are crackpots, that all politicians are rogues, that all educators are eggheads, that new ideas are subversive.

We are approaching a point in our national thinking where indictment is conviction and a charge is a proven fact. Those who rebel and dare to challenge commit the cardinal sin of questioning the status quo and, therefore, must be anti-American.

We substitute labels, labels such as radical and reactionary, for ideas. Every man must have a pigeon hole and in he goes, though he be round and the hole square.

One of the cynical bits of advice given a freshman Congressman is that he participate sparingly in debate.

"The things you don't say can never be used against you," he is warned.

What a commentary on our times. Remain silent or the mob will throw your words back in your teeth. Repress the expression of new ideas, lest the mob turn on you for disturbing its complacency. Wave your flag but be very careful about defending those parts of our Constitution which stand in the path of mob action. Assert your own patriotism, but don't bother to defend that of persons unjustly accused. The mob may not like it.

Who are responsible for this sorry state of affairs? What elements among us have developed this passion for conformity?

We have, in this great Nation of ours, a group of self-righteous, self-appointed people who believe they, or their leaders, are the keepers of the public conscience.

They say they are against sin, so all who disagree with their views on anything from a local ordinance to foreign policy, are for sin.

They say they are 100 percent American, so all who fight their ideas are automatically trying to destroy our country.

In their arrogance, they would pin the label of treason on our highest officials, our courts, our President, and our Congress if they make a single move contrary to the dicta of their leaders.

They are the appointed of the Lord, the saviors of democracy, the referees of public morals, the last voices of freedom in the land.

I do not suggest that these people are in the majority, but they are dangerous as long as the majority of us remains indifferent and allows their policy of sterility to go unchallenged.

Most of us have had the experience, at a baseball game, of being humiliated by the crudeness and cruelty of a few loud-voiced boosers.

We have cringed but remained silent, giving the impression that all of us are ignorant.

That was my experience during the contest over the Alaskan mental health bill. I knew the great body of decent American opinion would be on our side, given the facts, but I still had to go through the strain and heartbreak of false accusations, because the good people were silent and left the arena to the boosers.

I know not where life will lead you graduates of today. You will follow many different paths. Some of you will never see one another again.

But it is my earnest hope, as you leave here with your diplomas, that you will also take away a common resolve, to speak up when the self-righteous attack unfairly; to defend new ideas; to avoid—as a very pestilence—condemnation without knowledge.

If you do this, you will be keeping open the most important frontier our Nation has, the American mind.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the people of Chicago had the pleasure of playing host to a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota, who delivered the major address at the commemorative services observing the 168th anniversary of Poland's Constitution, sponsored by the Polish National Alliance and its president, Mr. Charles Rozmarek.

An estimated 100,000 citizens of Chicago assembled to hear Senator HUMPHREY speak on this historic document, which for the first time in history introduced to the people of Europe, and specifically to the people of Poland, in 1791, those principles of freedom and constitutional law which had been adopted by our own Nation only 4 years earlier.

I have the pleasure of introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today the text of Senator HUMPHREY's remarks which follow:

ALLIES BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

(Excerpts from remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, prepared for delivery before the Polish National Alliance, Chicago, Ill., May 3, 1959)

I am pleased to join you in celebration of the 168th anniversary of Poland's adoption of the Constitution of May 3, 1791. This great document, so much like our own basic charter, stands as a beacon light in the darkness of Soviet oppression. It inspires the hope that a free Poland will one day live again.

Few people on earth have over the years shown a greater love of liberty than the Polish people. Neither partition nor persecution has been able to stamp out the flame of liberty.

No American citizen can recount the glory of the American Revolution without paying tribute to those two great men who contributed so much to the success of Washington's armies—Generals Kosciuszko and Pulaski.

Poland has been called a pioneer in European liberalism. Certainly freedom-loving peoples everywhere in the world must take satisfaction from this passage in the Constitution which you commemorate today:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

Yes; the peoples of the world know and respect the aspiration of the Polish people for liberty, and are bound in spiritual ties with all the unfortunate peoples who remain behind the Iron Curtain. I can assure you that during my recent visit in the Soviet Union, I did not and could not forget the plight of the 100 million people of eastern Europe who suffer under the cruel yoke of atheistic and imperialistic communism.

The American people will never forsake them. The American people honor the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Baltic States, and East Germany for their devotion to the cause of freedom and independence.

But, above all, our thoughts go out to the devout and patriotic people of Poland—that

brave country which was first to take up arms in the defense of freedom in World War II, the country which was subjugated not by one oppressor, but by two; yet, the country whose spiritual voice still speaks so eloquently, so courageously through Cardinal Wyszynski.

Yes; our hearts go out to Joseph Cardinal Mindzenty too, and to all the people in martyred Hungary.

The Polish people, too, have eloquent voices speaking for them here in the United States. Certainly none has been more effective in molding the thinking of the U.S. Senate on the problems of central and eastern Europe than Mr. Z. Stypulkowski, Vice Premier of the Polish Government in London, and representative of Free Poland in Washington. His insights and wisdom have stimulated much constructive thinking among my colleagues in the Senate.

Yes, the plight of the captive nations is a subject close to the hearts of all of us.

It is unthinkable that we in the West should abandon these great peoples behind the Iron Curtain. There will come a day of eventual emancipation, and we must take all prudent steps necessary to hasten that day.

And it is not enough simply to voice this hope and declare our dedication to their cause. The peoples of the captive nations need something more tangible to give them faith for the future.

The peoples of the captive nations need a charter of hope from the West—a declaration of intent and concern from the leadership of the West.

First of all, we should place the fate of Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain on the agenda of every conference called to consider the problems of European security. We must never let the captive peoples nor their Soviet masters forget that we do not accept as right or final the imposition of Russian Communist rule in Eastern and Central Europe.

Secondly, we should actively counter Soviet demands for recognition of the status quo that Soviet occupation forces withdraw and that free and democratic elections be held in accordance with our solemn wartime pledges.

Yes, our constant objective must be the withdrawal of the Red army from Eastern Germany and central Europe.

Third, we must not permit ourselves to bargain with the freedoms of other peoples in order to maintain a conqueror's peace. We must remain loyal to our highest principles—that all peoples have an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Fourth, we must never lose the opportunity to point out to the world the monstrous hypocrisy of Soviet imperialism and colonialism. The Soviet leaders, who shed crocodile tears over the remnants of Western colonialism, have imposed in eastern Europe the most savage and brutal colonialism the world have ever known.

Finally, the charter of hope to the captive nations must include the unwritten assurance of courage on the part of the West—the demonstration that the Western democracies will not yield in the face of force or terror, will never submit to blackmail, and will always stand firmly on what we know to be right for us and for all men.

Speaking of Poland, I have already proposed the establishment of a binational Polish-American Foundation—to put to work the funds which have accumulated to the credit of the United States in the form of zloty, these funds from sale of our agricultural commodities. This foundation should be devoted to the building of creative institutions for the welfare of the Polish people.

As we approach the one thousandth year of Polish Christianity what greater contri-

bution could the West, and particularly the United States make, than to assist in the reconstruction of Poland's historic capital city—Warsaw?

There are many concrete things we could do in historic Warsaw which would stand as living symbols of American concern, and vivid demonstration of American friendship for the courageous peoples of Poland.

I am thinking, for example, of the rebuilding of Warsaw's famous Royal Castle—nearly destroyed during the Nazi siege of the capital city in 1939, and reduced to rubble during the Warsaw uprising in 1944. The plans for rebuilding this ancient castle in Poland's five-year economic plan have had to be abandoned for lack of funds. Let us step forward with an offer from Poland's friends in the West to rebuild the castle in recognition of Poland's great contribution to European civilization.

A second undertaking could be the provision of a home for national army veterans. While the present Polish regime has changed the policy of persecution of the underground army of World War II, nothing has been done to improve the conditions under which hundreds of thousands of these veterans live. These men and women were "our companions in arms" equally against the tyranny of Nazism, and the oppression of the Soviet armies.

We could undertake a great humanitarian task in the building and financing of a large modern hospital in Warsaw—perhaps a children's hospital. Not only would it give direct aid to many tens of thousands, but it would be another symbol of American compassion and friendship in a nation suffering from the effects of Soviet colonialism—a nation disastrously short of hospitals and medicines.

How dramatic it would be to replace the war-damaged buildings that now face the monument of Stalin in a public square in Warsaw with a children's hospital—a permanent reminder to the Polish people of the blessings of freedom—directly across the square from Stalin's tragic reminder of oppression.

Yes, and we could build workers' settlements based on western models—yes, homes for workers and yet displays of western living, western concern for people, western initiative.

These things we could do. These concrete acts of friendship for the Polish people we could undertake. No Communist leader would be able to explain them away. Every Polish man and woman and child would know they came out of the open hands and heart of America.

Yes, indeed, I believe that Poland will one day be free again.

I believe the whole world will one day be free of Communist oppression. I believe that mankind has the capacity to live in peace and justice.

But this will not come just by wishing for it. What we must do is to prove to the world—to the free peoples and the subjugated peoples, too—that our free system can beat the Russian system on every front.

What we must do is compete with the Russians—in fact, out-compete them. This competition is being forced on us by the many faceted Soviet challenge.

We must meet and overcome the Soviet challenge in every area—economically, culturally, militarily, and in the important field of international persuasion.

Competition with Russia will be a long, hard pull. We cannot hope to win with a business as usual attitude. We must have a new sense of urgency and purpose. The struggle is, after all, a struggle between freedom and tyranny.

We cannot win this struggle alone with H-bombs and missiles and the other engines of war—we need also machines, farm products, technology, economic assistance, and

above all a renewed devotion to the human values that will endure.

We will do it by helping to create an atmosphere which gave birth to the Polish Constitution of 1791 and the American Constitution of 1789.

How can we prevail in this mighty struggle with Russia?

First, we must compete effectively in the fields of science and technology.

Let us not make the error of underrating Soviet advances in these fields. While we and our allies are still ahead, we must admit the gap is narrowing, and they are breathing down our necks.

We cannot afford to be complacent. We must build the greatest educational system ever known to free peoples and we must do it now.

Second, we must compete in the field of international persuasion, and by this I mean not only mere words, but words backed by deeds.

The propaganda of the deed, such as the launching of a tangible food for peace campaign, will be far more convincing than 10 million words beamed to the world by short-wave radio.

There is no reason why our agricultural surpluses should pile up in storage bins while millions of human beings are suffering from undernourishment and stark hunger? That is the heart of the food for peace plan which I am sponsoring in Congress. According to my plan America's abundance of food and fiber should be used as a positive instrument of foreign policy and a constructive force for peace.

Third, we must compete with Russia economically.

The dollar competes with the ruble not only in the production race, but also in providing development capital for impoverished economies in the politically uncommitted areas of the world. We cannot compete effectively with more than 4 million workers unemployed and with our industrial plants operating considerably below capacity.

Finally, we must compete militarily. We and our allies must be strong—yes, have superior strength. We will help our allies to maintain adequate forces. Measures of military strength—missiles, nuclear power, strategic and tactical aircraft, and naval forces—will weigh in our favor if we make sure the defense budget is based on the power we need and not trimmed to meet somebody's conception of a balanced budget.

I have always supported adequate funds for the military defense of this Nation and the West. Indeed, without a strong shield of military strength we would be helplessly at the mercy of the Soviet Union.

Incidentally, one of the great deterrents to military action by the Soviet Union is its lack of confidence and distrust of the situation in Eastern Europe. The Soviet leaders know that they would have to keep scores of thousands of troops tied up to protect their rear and their supply lines from the freedom fighters of the captive nations if they launched a military attack on the West.

But military strength can in the long run only buy the time for more constructive approaches to peace.

I have spoken about the accumulation of Polish zlotys which has built up in past years—now useless—which has reached more than \$150 million in value. And I have proposed a Polish-American Foundation to put these zlotys to work in the interest of improving relations between the Polish peoples and their friends in America, through such projects as the participation in the rebuilding of Warsaw.

But there is far more that we could do, in a less dramatic fashion—but, nevertheless, in ways that would build hope and friendship for the West in Poland.

The foundation would stimulate programs of travel between the two countries. The best way for us to tell our story to the people of Poland and for them to tell their story to the people of America is by personal visits on a people-to-people basis. And there are no better ambassadors from our side than the Polish-Americans who know and love the democratic processes of our great country.

Yes; through such a foundation we could help in many ways to provide medical education, public health facilities, medicine for children, school lunch programs—deeds, and not just words, in the finest tradition of Western civilization and American ideals.

It is the people we must reach. Yes, it is the people of Poland and the other captive nations whom we must hold to the West, shield from despair, show the light of eventual freedom.

Here and now we must rededicate ourselves to strengthening America's ties to these peoples in the darkness of Soviet tyranny, these brave peoples whose tenacious courage has never failed in the face of repeated invasions and tyranny, and who hold silently to the hope of freedom yet again.

Let us take inspiration from these silent allies, from their courage, from their determination, from their toughness and tenacity. They are our brothers; we shall never forget them or give up working for their freedom.

Their cause is the cause of every man and woman in the world who loves liberty.

Nuclear Test Ban Issue—A Course for United States Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this means to call attention to my remarks in this Record following the day's legislative business under title "Nuclear Test Ban Issue—A Course for United States Action." They set out the moral, practical and military reasons for a four-point program suggested for United States action involving:

First. Announcement of indefinite cessation of the only kind of nuclear testing producing fallout, namely, testing in the atmosphere, attaching reasonable conditions regarding problems arising from future actions by other powers.

Second. The diligent seeking of international agreements amongst the nuclear powers, including Soviet Russia, likewise to ban atmospheric tests, as proposed by President Eisenhower to Premier Khrushchev.

Third. The declaration of a moratorium on talks aimed at banning below-ground and above-atmosphere testing until the air is cleared of emotion, propaganda and misinformation regarding fallout, until the problem of detecting violations is understood, and until the other military and moral questions inhering in the issue are debated and answered.

Fourth. The candid release to the public of data regarding testing, detection and other aspects of nuclear weaponry

which are not properly of a restricted security classification.

I also call attention to the following related materials to be found in the Record:

"The Case Against the Nuclear Test Ban," an editorial from Air Force magazine, Wednesday, April 29.

"Communist Diplomatic Perfidy," my compilation of Soviet treaty violations and reasons therefor, Thursday, May 14, at pages 8210-8213.

"Nuclear Test Ban Pitfalls," a memorandum by Joint Atomic Energy Committee Consultant Thomas E. Murray evaluating the United States inconsistencies regarding the issue of nuclear test bans, Wednesday, May 20, at pages 8679-8682.

Townsend Plan, H.R. 4000, Is the Essence of the Golden Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a report recently issued by the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics of the University of California. The researchers found that in 1958 a wage earner with two children needed \$6,086.88 a year if he lived in a rented home, or \$6,435.11 a year if he owned his own home, in order to give his family the standard of living that public opinion currently recognizes as necessary to health and reasonably comfortable living.

To put it another way, the man who rented his home should have had \$117 a week and the man who owned his home needed \$123.75 a week. The actual average weekly earnings of factory workers in California in 1958 was \$83.71—a far cry from the standard the Heller committee deems desirable.

It is quite obvious that even people who are engaged in gainful employment are victims of the gap which separates income and the costs of living—this despite the fact that employed persons often are able to adjust to some extent by obtaining increases in wages and salaries.

The Heller report, it seems to me, also serves to dramatize a situation with which it is not even concerned. I refer to the plight of persons who are retired and are living on fixed incomes such as social security benefits. There is no way for these people to adjust to increasing costs of living.

I am familiar with the argument that the 85th Congress took cognizance of rising costs by increasing social security benefits an average of 7 percent. But this was a "cost-of-living adjustment" in name only, for at the time we passed the bill, costs already had risen by 8 percent since the previous social security increase, and since last summer they have continued to rise, with the result

that social security benefits were outdated before the increases became effective. Moreover, the old level of benefits was so palpably inadequate that the tiny 7 percent increase amounted to scarcely more than a drop in the bucket.

This whole problem of relating income to living costs has achieved the dimensions of a national challenge. People still on a payroll may perhaps enjoy some protection, but those already retired are at the mercy of an expanding society. Naturally, we want our economy to expand, but expansion seems to bring with it, higher prices. Surely we are not going to accept the blessings of expansion by penalizing those who are helpless to accommodate themselves to the price spiral.

I believe there is an answer to the problem and that it is contained in H.R. 4000, introduced by our colleague, Congressman BLATNIK of Minnesota. This proposed legislation, more familiarly known as the Townsend Plan bill, would correct what I believe to be one of the major shortcomings of the present Social Security Act. It would create a system under which retirement benefits would keep pace with the cost of living. H.R. 4000 proposes a modest tax on gross receipts. In times of high prices, and thus a high volume of gross receipts, the tax naturally would raise more revenue, and since this revenue would be immediately distributed in the form of benefits, it would enable recipients to cope realistically with the higher level of payments.

We have accepted the principle of parity for farmers; why should we not also provide parity for pensioners? We have been unable to do this under the present social security system, and the result has been grave discrimination against those saddled with fixed incomes. But we can provide a measure of parity with H.R. 4000.

It is the only retirement proposal I know of which has a built-in system to guarantee that pensioners will always, and at any given time, receive benefits in terms of purchasing power geared to price structure at the time the benefits are received.

It was over 25 years ago, Mr. Speaker, that I first was convinced that a retirement income or old-age pension system, as you may prefer to label it, could be the vehicle for the distribution of dollar dividends which would mean security for our senior citizens and jobs for our youth. Since then and to some substantial extent because of the organizational work of the national Townsend leadership, social security was enacted. Today, even though inadequate, this social legislation is the sole support and hope of millions of our worthy citizens. But we need to do more. We can do more. Our economy will prosper to such extent as we improve the living standards of those of our people who are now only existing on poverty-ridden and disease-infected levels. While in Maine recently, I was continuously approached by my constituents in the retirement-age brackets, asking when could they expect more realistic pension incomes.

The principle outlined in H.R. 4000 is a humanitarian principle. It is the es-

sence of the Golden Rule written into a legislative proposal. But, more than that, it has the economic promise of a social dividend taken from the top of our gross national product, which would serve as a most effective built-in stabilizer against recessions, unemployment, and stagnation of our economy. H.R. 4000 means real security for our retired citizens and growth and expansion for all.

Michigan: A Study in Character Assassination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I am moved to make this statement by my grave concern over the increasing—but completely unwarranted—assaults on the good name of the sovereign State of Michigan. As a citizen and Representative of the State of Michigan, I feel it my duty to come to her defense and to clear the air of the smoke from the various barrages which have been leveled against her. For whether these attacks are merely misguided, misinformed commentary or the conscious, self-serving efforts of some who would reap gains at Michigan's expense, they have the single effect of a deliberate character assassination of the fair State of Michigan.

Even a brief consideration of the charges to which I refer will readily show them to be not only unwarranted but, in large part, untrue, or at best, highly distorted versions of the real facts. Allow me, then, to take up the most prominent of these anti-Michigan allegations and see how they hold up under examination.

One frequent assertion is that Michigan is a welfare State—this with a derogatory intonation. This accusation has a twofold meaning to the critics who make it. First, of all these accusers mean to point a contemptuous finger at what the Los Angeles Times has termed the "highly advanced concept of paternalism" in Michigan and the invasion of local responsibilities they say it involves. Second, they point to a 100-percent rise in State spending in Michigan over the past decade and proceed, by implication, to attribute this increase to the support of various welfare programs by the State. From here it is an easy jump for these critics to assert that the State is broke and that this bankruptcy is directly due to Michigan's welfare activities. These are harsh and harmful words, indeed. Let us examine them. If they are accusing Michigan of being interested in the well-being of her citizens, Michigan gladly and readily admits to her guilt. The only real fact to be found in this diatribe is that State spending has doubled in Michigan in the past decade. However, this would seem to compare rather favorably with the

fact that State spending—for all States—now totals more than 5 times as much as it did in 1946. Consider also that, in terms of dollars and cents, welfare costs each Michigan citizen \$16.30—State and local taxes combined. According to a new U.S. Census report, this figure puts Michigan 34th among all the States in this respect—lower than 33 others.

Another charge, "taxes are out of line," can easily be disproven in the same fashion. The dollars and cents total of State and local levies in the State of Michigan is \$181.13 per citizen. In terms of cash outlay this figure ranks 12th in the Nation. However, this same figure, when considered as a percentage of personal income, is 31st on the national scale—behind 30 of her sister States.

There is a companion allegation that the tax burden in Michigan is stampeding business out of the State. This is patently false. Industry in Michigan spent \$110 million for expansion in 1958. This represented a jump of nearly \$30 million over the 1957 figure and placed Michigan fourth among all the States in industrial construction in 1958.

The epithet, "unhealthy business climate," is another fusillade of the anti-Michigan invective. This is hardly worthy of our consideration since it is too vague to have any real meaning. If this charge has not already been rendered completely without substance by what I have said thus far, let me point out a few simple facts that will complete the annihilation. The well-known Big Three of the automobile world alone have invested in excess of \$3½ billion in Michigan facilities since 1950. The announced intentions of but a few of the leading businesses in Michigan have earmarked in excess of \$425 million for investment and expansion in Michigan. Does all this smack of an unhealthy business climate? Hardly. Rather these are the past facts and the future plans of the leading business leaders of the country who, better than anyone else, are able to gage the business climate in which they exist.

It must, by now, be abundantly clear to all that the charges leveled against the State of Michigan in all of these areas are simply untrue. With States, as with men, no possession is more precious than a good name. I sincerely hope that in demonstrating the utter falsity of the attacks on the good name of the State of Michigan I have fully vindicated her character and integrity in the eyes of the whole Nation.

Big Labor Union Power a Growing Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, big labor union bosses are wielding too much po-

litical and economic power today. Organized by Samuel Gompers, the "Grand Old Man" of union labor, to combat the power of the industrial barons of 40 years ago, big labor has gotten out of hand and some of its unscrupulous present-day leaders are wrecking our national economy.

Inflation has been speeded up by the exorbitant wage demands of these union leaders. Prices of American-made goods have soared. Imports from cheap-labor countries are pouring into the United States as never before. American exports have been drastically reduced because we have been priced out of world markets. American production machinery has been slowed down, with the result that many American workers have lost their jobs.

Why? Mostly because of the unchecked political and economic power of the leaders of big labor.

The rank and file of labor union members have little or nothing to say about all this. Policies and programs of the big labor unions are determined by the labor bosses—not by the labor union members.

The rank and file of labor union members have no way to protect themselves from the corruption, the misappropriation of union funds, the dictatorial methods of their self-perpetuating leaders—abuses and corruption recently revealed by the McClellan Senate committee.

Samuel Lubell, a noted political and economic writer, interviewed a wide cross section of steelworkers on the eve of their leaders' negotiations for a new contract. Men after men told him: "We don't want higher wages. And we don't want to strike because a strike means a loss of pay that we'll never make up."

The magazine U.S. News & World Report confirmed Mr. Lubell's findings in its issue of May 25, saying:

It is being pointed out that the rank and file of steel workers are not in a mood to strike. They are not keen for wage increases that vanish in higher prices and taxes.

Yet the big union leaders continue to insist: Higher wages or we strike.

Mr. Speaker, what will that mean? More inflation. What has it meant in the past? Well, featherbedding and increased wages out of all proportion to increased productivity. These are factors that enable cheap foreign-made goods to undersell American-made goods in world markets and in our own American markets.

For the first time since 1865—almost 100 years—British exports to the United States exceed her imports from the United States. And the same situation is rapidly becoming true in our commerce with Japan, Germany, Belgium, and other nations.

Mr. Speaker, because the cost of production—wages—has been pushed so high by the labor leaders, American goods are in less and less demand in world markets. The downward trend of American sales in foreign countries is becoming increasingly serious. Our prices for goods are entirely out of line with the prices of similar goods produced by exporting nations with which

we have to compete. When American prices are too high for American buyers—as they are today—they are far too high for low-wage foreign people to buy.

Summed up, all this means fewer jobs for American workers and more jobs for foreign workers.

Is that good, I ask, for American workers generally?

Virginia Rescue Squad Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Virginia are observing Rescue Squad Week during this week of May 17-23, and I wish to call this special observance to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

As far as can be determined, Virginia is the only State known to honor each year the humanitarian work of organized rescue and first aid groups.

Because of the extreme importance of the work carried on by this volunteer organization in assisting those in need and distress, I take this occasion to commend the many squads in Virginia and their many, many devoted members.

The Governor of Virginia, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, has issued the following proclamation on this special observance. It is included as a part of these remarks:

RESCUE SQUAD WEEK

The people of Virginia are grateful for the fine service being rendered in a great variety of emergencies by members of the lifesaving and rescue squads. These groups, day or night, are available to answer calls from their fellow citizens and also give generously of their time in presentation of demonstrations in first aid and safety measures. They also constitute a corps of readily available personnel for civil defense service in event of major disaster.

I salute these crews and members of the Virginia Association of Rescue Squads and their Ladies Auxiliaries and invite the citizens of the Commonwealth to join in tribute to them by appropriate observance of Rescue Squad Week May 17-23, 1959.

J. LINDSAY ALMOND, Jr.,
Governor.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in this session of Congress to materially assist the rescue squads of the Nation in their work. This bill is H.R. 105 and would provide that surplus Federal property could be donated to rescue squads; it is presently pending in the Subcommittee on Donable Property of the Government Operations Committee.

Recently, the International Rescue and First Aid Association—IRFAA—endorsed the provisions of H.R. 105. I called attention to this endorsement in the RECORD of March 12, 1959.

The IRFAA has now advised me that endorsement of H.R. 105 has also come from the Minnesota Rescue and First Aid Association. The Minnesota endorse-

ment is the latest of several endorsements from such State organizations.

It is my sincere hope that hearings will soon be held on H.R. 105 and the measure reported to the House.

There is printed in the International Rescuer, monthly publication of IRFAA, the following quotation from the Bible:

And a certain Samaritan . . . going up to him bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine; and setting him upon his own beast, brought him to an inn and took care of him. (Luke 10: 33-34.)

This perhaps sums up the spirit that is typical of the rescue squads in the Nation as they go about their dedicated work of assisting people in distress.

I know that each of my colleagues joins me today in paying this brief tribute to the rescue squads of Virginia and America during Virginia Rescue Squad Week.

Postage Stamp in Honor of Garibaldi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for the issuance of a special commemorative postage stamp, of the Freedom Fighter series, in honor of Giuseppe Garibaldi, the famous 19th century Italian patriot under whose courageous leadership the people of Italy achieved national unity and independence. My colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr., joins with me in cosponsoring this legislation.

Giuseppe Garibaldi was born at Nice, France, on July 4, 1807, exactly on the date only 31 years after the United States had declared its independence. There is no doubt that he was greatly inspired by our concept of liberty and national independence, and used it to encourage the people of Italy to learn from our example. He died in Italy on June 2, 1882, at the age of 75.

Garibaldi came from a poor fisherman family and received little education in his youth. He was a sailor on various trading vessels and became a strong supporter of Mazzini to set up a Republic in Italy. In 1834 he was condemned to death for his support of Mazzini, but he succeeded in escaping from Italy and made his way to South America. He entered the service of the Republic of Rio Grande and aided the people of Montevideo in their struggle for independence. He was the leader of a famous Italian legion and eventually earned the title of "Hero of Montevideo."

At the outbreak of the revolutions of 1848 in Europe, particularly the uprising against Austria which then controlled important parts of northern Italy, Garibaldi decided to return to Europe and join his countrymen in the struggle for Italian independence. He raised a group of volunteers and harassed the Austrians,

but his efforts at this time did not succeed. He then proceeded to Rome where he was appointed by Mazzini to command the forces of the Republic. He fought against overwhelming odds and desperately defended Rome against the Austrian onslaught for 30 days, but finally had to retreat. As a result of this struggle he became known as the defender of Rome.

Garibaldi was once again forced to leave Italy, and this time he decided to come to the United States, which already then was regarded by the nations of the world as the champion of liberty and freedom. To Garibaldi, as to many others after him, America was both a place of refuge and strength; consequently, it was natural for him to turn to this country for support in his struggle to achieve freedom for his people.

He arrived in this country on July 30, 1850, and landed at New York, where his arrival had been eagerly awaited by people of all walks of life, not only those of Italian descent. Already at this time he had a great reputation as a fighter for freedom. On the day of his arrival in New York, the newspaper New York Tribune wrote as follows of him:

The ship *Waterloo* arrived here from Liverpool this morning, bringing the world renowned Garibaldi, the hero of Montevideo and the defender of Rome. He will be welcomed by those who know him as becomes his chivalrous character and his services in behalf of liberty.

A huge demonstration had been planned for him, including an official welcome at the Battery, greetings by the mayor of New York, and a parade up Broadway to the Astor House—as we are in the habit of welcoming great heroes in our own day. But Garibaldi refused this honor on the ground he was only an exile from his native land and did not wish to cause this country political embarrassment. In a letter to the committee planning the demonstration, he said:

No such public exhibition is necessary to assure me of the sympathy of my countrymen, of the American people, and of all true Republicans. * * * Though a public manifestation of this feeling might yield much gratification to me, an exile from my native land, severed from my children and mourning the overthrow of my country's freedom by means of foreign interference, yet believe me that I would rather avoid it, and be permitted to * * * await a more favorable opportunity for the redemption of my country from foreign and domestic oppressors.

Next to the cause to which I have devoted myself, I value nothing so highly as the approbation of this great people, and I am convinced I shall enjoy that when they become satisfied that I have honestly and faithfully served the cause of freedom, in which they have themselves set so noble an example to the world.

Garibaldi remained in the United States only for about 10 months. During this time he refused to become a burden to his friends and insisted on doing menial work in order to support himself and to send money to his wife and children in Italy. He finally obtained a job in a candle factory on Staten Island—and to this day the great vat where this Italian patriot stirred tallow alongside

his American coworkers has been preserved because of its historical interest and its significance for United States-Italian relations.

From the United States, Garibaldi proceeded to South America and ultimately made his way back to Italy again to fight for its freedom and independence. He participated in the war of 1859 in which he scored important victories in the Alps region. He helped free Sicily in 1860, occupied Naples, and joined the two Sicilies with Italy, but declined all honors for himself. He then retired to his farm on the island of Caprera, where he made his home for the remainder of his life. From there he came forth on few special occasions, such as in 1864 when he made a visit to Britain where he received an enthusiastic welcome; in 1870 when he offered his help to the French Republic in the war against Germany; and again in 1875 when he was seated in the Italian Parliament after Italy had become a united and independent nation.

Garibaldi is sometimes described as "the George Washington of Italy." Surely, a man of his caliber and his achievements, who was instrumental in winning freedom and independence for his people, deserves the title of "Freedom Fighter" and as such should be included in our list of those to be honored by special postage stamps. The issuance of such a stamp would add to the good will and the strengthening of friendship between the United States and Italy, which is one of our most important allies in the world.

In conclusion, I wish to express my appreciation to the Italian Historical Society of America for bringing this matter to my attention and for suggesting the issuance of a stamp in honor of Garibaldi. The society deserves to be commended for this proposal. I know that millions of Americans of Italian descent would welcome the issuance of such a stamp and would feel proud of this honor bestowed upon a man who has contributed so much to further the cause of freedom in Italy and in the world.

Wheat Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include correspondence between the Honorable Roy W. Wier, Representative of the Third District of Minnesota, and Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

In response to a telegram received by a number of us from Mr. Thatcher, Congressman Wier wrote a letter which goes to the heart of the present trouble in agriculture. Once again, he displays an understanding of farm problems which

has made him a true friend of agriculture in the House of Representatives.

The telegram and letter follow:

ST. PAUL, MINN., May 18, 1959.

Representative ROY W. WIER,
Washington, D.C.:

Last week the House Agriculture Committee gave the President what he asked for—a wheat bill to meet an impending disaster in wheat. The bill recommended that wheat acreage be cut 30 percent next year and the price support be boosted as much as 20 percent. While this would reduce the wheat surplus there is some question as to whether the price increase is enough to protect family-farmer income.

But since then there has been too much jockeying around—too much backing and filling—and too much evidence of retreat in Congress. The House Agriculture Committee has recalled its bill. The Senate Agriculture Committee has reported out a bill that is unsatisfactory to farmers—and could well play into the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Congress ought to know how farmers feel. No wheat farmer can willingly accept a big cut in acreage unless he is sure of a substantial increase in the support price—to protect his income. Every farmer knows the Senate Agriculture Committee bill will not reduce production by a single acre or a single bushel. It only cuts the farmer's pay. This kind of a bill is doing just what the Secretary of Agriculture wants. It is the kind of a bill that will help kill all price supports. Farmers in our spring wheat States expect their Congressmen to stand up and be counted. They expect something more from the Agriculture Committee members than committee room politics. To say that this bill—or that bill—will not pass Congress or get by the President's veto will not satisfy farmers.

Farmers expect the House and Senate Agriculture Committees to agree on a sound and reasonable wheat bill that will protect the income of producers and reduce wheat production. Anything less is unsatisfactory. At the moment, farmers are wondering whether many of the committee members do not know what they want, or are pliable to pressure from the Department of Agriculture. To argue that a good farm bill is not politically acceptable is no argument at all. Let the farm committee members do the best job they can and then let Congress decide whether the bill will give farmers a fair break. Then it is up to the President to decide whether or not he will veto a fair break for farmers, then the record is there—for everyone to see.

M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager, Farmers Union
Grain Terminal Association and
President, National Federation of
Grain Cooperatives.

MAY 19, 1959.

M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager, Farmers Union Grain
Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR SIR: I have read your telegram of May 18 covering the agricultural situation as it exists today with a great deal of interest. As one who watched the agricultural decline and crash in the 1920's and the early 1930's, I cannot help but be deeply concerned at the present agricultural trend. Following the last crash, when the farm land, to a large extent, fell into the hands of the mortgage holders and the big insurance companies as well as the State of Minnesota through its Rural Credits Act, the farmers to a large degree thanks to their industry, thrift, and energy, were able to pull themselves out.

Just what the results of the present situation will be is something for one gifted with prophecy. I hesitate to contemplate it as

I have no desire to be known as an apostle of gloom. Nevertheless, if the farmer is able to pull out of this one that is now pending due to the 6 years' efforts of the present administration led by Mr. Benson to destroy the very minimum of protection the farmers might enjoy, is beyond my capacity to foretell.

Sometimes I wonder just how many beatings the farmer can take and still hold up his head and be recognized as a desirable citizen. Wherever communism might hold sway in the world, nothing in my estimation has been more unjust in economic effects than the treatment of our American farmers.

Not being a member of the Agriculture Committee, I have little to do with the formulating of a program calculated to meet the present emergency; but I assure you, and I think that you will recognize this from the record, that I shall at all times be found in their battle, for the farmer when the chips are down. And I must say that I feel a deep appreciation to you and the Farmers Union for helping and guiding me through the better than 10 years I have been in Congress in matters affecting our agriculture.

Very truly yours,

ROY W. WIER,
Member of Congress, Third District,
Minnesota.

Plan To Aid Our Lagging Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on April 7 I introduced for myself and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the U.S. Arts Foundation Act (S. 1598) to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation designed to stimulate throughout the United States the study and advancement of the performing arts. The Foundation would assist and encourage productions of plays, concerts, ballet and other performances by marshaling professional advice, compiling registers of theaters and personnel, and providing modest subventions to help with the difference between box office receipts and costs, both from its own appropriations and from contributions made by private sources.

Appended hereto is an article from the April 5, 1959, issue of the Sunday New York Times magazine describing this Foundation, the need for it, and what it could accomplish to stimulate artistic achievements in the United States, both for the sake of communities now neglected and for the benefit of our position in the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAN TO AID OUR LAGGING CULTURE

(By JACOB K. JAVITS)

WASHINGTON.—Culture only too often has been a suspect word in the American language. At the very beginning of the Nation, we acquired a reputation—now undeserved—for being crude and “rock-ribbed.”

As far back as 1842, when the New Orleans musical prodigy, Louis Moreau Gottschalk, applied for permission to study piano at the Paris Conservatoire, he was laughed down. He had come from America, and that was enough. “America is a country of steam engines,” snorted the famous Prof. Pierre Zimmerman, who refused to take Gottschalk as a pupil.

The old traditions linger. We as a Nation are still, sometimes, looking for a practical return on a cultural investment. Unless something will “pay off” concretely, we often will have none of it. This attitude has long tended to persist in the thinking of our Government on cultural matters, and since the notes of a Beethoven symphony cannot be weighed and assessed, since the tread of an actor's foot on a stage does not rock the earth, our cultural institutions have been left by our Government largely to shift for themselves. Whatever men and women have done in the arts, they have done largely on their own.

Except for some tentative help during the WPA days, our Government has never given official recognition to the arts. Where most other civilized nations in the world have lent a helping hand to their artists, we have stood aloof. That our culture is in as healthy a state as it remains a miracle. For, with practically no Government help, we have created symphony orchestras, dance groups and a theater that the world regards with respect. Certainly it is a tribute to our people, and a testament of their aspirations toward the better things in life, that they have accomplished so much on their own.

But in a country of our size, the sum total of artistic accomplishment is not nearly what it should be. A few great orchestras in a few great cities, with large sections of the country foreclosed to serious performances of music, dance, and theater—this does not make for cultural adequacy. Our culture needs help and needs it badly. The time has come when the Federal Government must lend a hand, in accordance with the widely accepted Lincolnian philosophy that the Federal Government has the responsibility to help people do those things that they cannot do for themselves.

I believe that we can best accomplish this objective of strengthening American culture through the establishment of a U.S. Arts Foundation that would bring the prestige of the Federal Government to bear to develop more fully and to disseminate more widely our cultural heritage. To that end, I will shortly introduce in Congress a bill calling for the establishment of such a Foundation.

Never has the time demanded such a project more urgently. In self-defense, if for no less selfish reason, we must be prepared to meet the cultural challenge of our competitors. Private enterprise has done a noble job up to now, but we found private funds could not do the job in the international arena. And private funds cannot take care of nurturing all the talent we now have, nor assure the next generation of every possible chance to develop itself to its full potentiality. If we are to measure up to the stature of leader of the free world, we must act as such; and a nation's civilization is equated in many places with its degree of culture.

Our performing arts need support in virtually every area. Our major opera, symphony, and ballet groups struggle from year to year with deficits that become increasingly hard to meet only with private funds. Our young artists and creators must fight all kinds of obstacles to make careers; and many give up the fight. A helping hand must be extended to talent. A correspondent to the New York Times, writing about the woeful lack of string players in this country, points out that “the American

Federation of Musicians will hold a string congress in Oklahoma this summer. We have almost 180 million people in the United States, and 50—yes, 50—children will have scholarships to the congress. It should be 5,000.”

The American Federation of Musicians is doing all it can, and so are other worthy groups devoted to helping the musician, actor, and dancer. But *ars longa, vita brevis*—and their efforts are a pail of water in the ocean. The cultural surge in America is too big and private funds alone cannot keep up with all the needs of the national interest. For every city that has a theater movement, there are 20 that need one. Opera, even on a semipermanent basis, is missing from all but six or seven cities in America (even the proud Metropolitan, our leading opera house, operates only about 6 months of the year, whereas most opera houses in Europe have much longer seasons, often 11 months).

The ballet renaissance in America has seen the emergence of lively groups in representative sections of the country, but all of them, even our three big touring companies, work gallantly on a shoestring and would go out of existence if private funds were not wearily dredged up, funds that are not nearly sufficient to give the companies a sense of security or scope.

It should not be left to private enterprise alone to integrate the arts on a full-time communal basis, no more than it should be the job of private enterprise alone to support all the museums and libraries. It is true that, in a relatively few metropolitan centers, we have developed a rich and flourishing cultural activity. But the majority of Americans around the country face a meager cultural fare and, indeed, are blacked out of professional cultural activities for a good part of the year.

We are probably the only large nation in the world that does not have a Government-sponsored opera, theater, or symphony. England and Canada have their arts councils, Russia supports well over 30 full-time opera houses, not to mention orchestras, theaters, and dance groups. Nearly every country in Latin America pitches in to help its cultural organizations, often with results that achieve worldwide fame. Because Mexico, for example, engaged in a large-scale program of commissioning murals for its public buildings, the Mexican school of mural painting was stimulated to a point where it developed into one of the most significant contemporary artistic manifestations.

In Italy, one cannot go far without encountering a subsidized opera house. Virtually every city in Germany has its state opera, theater, and orchestra, financed by grants from the federal, state, and local governments. In France, the Opéra and Opéra-Comique enjoy grants the size of which would make the director of our major opera house turn cartwheels of glee down Broadway.

Last year Austria spent \$5,800,000 on its four state theaters in Vienna and plans a slight increase for 1959. This was larger than the sum Austria paid to its entire foreign service. Imagine: \$5,800,000 out of a total national budget of \$1,500 million.

Thus, while the proposed bill for an Arts Foundation might be considered precedent-shattering in the United States, it would be taken for granted nearly anywhere else in the world. An Arts Foundation in this country can be instrumental in helping to create a truly national establishment of theater, music, opera, and dance. It would give assistance to both professional and amateur segments of the performing arts. It would encourage performances of the best we have in great areas of the country where little is now available. And it would encourage widespread training and teaching of the arts

so that more young people may receive encouragement and direction in realizing to the full their artistic potential.

The bill would provide for Federal assistance to private, nonprofit theater, opera, symphony, dance, and other arts groups; to accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and municipally sponsored arts councils and commissions for the presentation of and instruction of the living arts.

After the program is under way, it is estimated that expenditures under the bill would not exceed \$5 million annually. (There is every indication that this amount would stimulate as much as \$50 million in private activity in the performing arts, over and above what is now being spent.)

Responsibility for making the necessary artistic judgments and for channeling the funds would be in the hands of panels of specialists in the various arts, functioning under a 12-member board of trustees composed of distinguished private citizens appointed by the President. Those trustees would select the chief officer of the Foundation. Naturally, the Foundation would be expected to function with complete freedom. Politics can and must be kept out of its operations, as politics has been kept out of the International Exchange Program of the American National Theater and Academy under the aegis of the State Department.

Such a program would, of course, be only a modest start. I do not envisage a series of Government-sponsored theaters and musical organizations. Nor would the Arts Foundation compete with existent organizations. It would instead complement them in the nonprofit field. College theaters would be given small supplementary grants for tours to localities seldom visited by the large organizations. Small cities would be encouraged to set up cultural projects along the lines established by the New York City Center of Music and Drama. Perhaps a grant to some of our important musical organizations would enable them to extend their tours of the Nation. If the box-office receipts did not cover the costs, the Government would help to meet a loss.

Professional help could be supplied to some of the more than 2,000 community theaters in the country. Eventually some of those theaters might become the nucleus of professional companies able to support a full season of theater. Traveling repertory companies would be established. Scholarships could be provided to some of the talented students of the more than 400 colleges and universities that offer degrees in the drama. Young musicians could also be helped by scholarships. Above all, so many neglected audiences of America could have the chance to breathe some of the cultural air they now lack. Who knows but that such exposure to the arts might stimulate the emergence of an American Mozart or Cornelle?

The initial sum of \$2,500,000 is, as noted, small—about one three-hundredth of 1 percent of the proposed Federal budget for 1959-60. But, small as it is, it would be a tremendous stimulus to the arts in America, if only by assuring the artist—and the whole world—that the American Government has taken, for the first time, an affirmative position toward our cultural heritage.

Perhaps the events of the last few years may have prepared our legislators for the creation of an Arts Foundation. For, within the last decade, our Government has lent a helping hand to art and artists through the international exchange program, supplying financial assistance to get them overseas. We were, indeed, almost forced to do so. For it is a moot question whether the Government would have been able to get the money, even at this late date, to show the world some of our cultural resources had not our great rival, Russia, started sending battalions—no, divisions—of its cultural armies all over the world.

It is not the specific purpose of the proposed Arts Foundation to send American artists abroad. But the Arts Foundation could certainly help to create such a renaissance of cultural activity in the United States as to increase materially our cultural stature in the international arena. The Russian artists, of course, do a tremendous propaganda job. Everywhere they go—and they go everywhere—they instill in the minds of their hosts, by word or deed, the argument that Russia, far from being a warlike nation, is interested primarily in peace and culture; that the great Russian bear would spend all his time and energies sniffing flowers if given the chance.

Repeated often enough, any message begins to be believed. The fact remains that the cultural message is international, and Russia spends enormously more on its culture than we do on ours, to the applause of people throughout the world, and to our detriment. Of course, the cry will go up in certain quarters that the Federal Government has no business engaging in an arts program, just as similar objections were raised against all of the new programs that the Government entered into to keep pace with the times and with the development of America.

Critics blasted the social security program as Government encroachment upon free enterprise and the private lives of our citizens. Critics blasted the establishment of Federal minimum wage laws as a violation of industry's prerogatives. Critics blasted the advent of unemployment compensation, of Federal aid to hospital construction, of the Rural Electrification Administration and of the Federal Reclamation Service as unwarranted interference by the Federal Establishment with the national economy or the rights of the individual. Yet today all those programs are accepted and regarded as integral parts of our society.

There are peripheral arguments against an Arts Foundation, some of them well-meaning but certainly refutable. Federal participation in the arts, some lament, means the suffocation of the creative genius of the artist. As if Beethoven, or Van Gogh, or any creative artist who ever lived was in the habit of turning down commissions.

An artist will create best when given the most opportunities, and happily, as long as he has entire freedom to create what he wants. He is his own master, not the servant of the state. In Russia, where the creative artist is the servant of the state, the esthetic worth of much of that country's serious art has been highly dubious during the last generation. As long as America remains America, that cannot happen here.

And what about Federal competition with private industry? The musicians in America will respond to this with hollow laughter. "What private industry?" they will ask. Virtually all serious, large-scale musical organizations in America today are nonprofit and are run at a loss. As for so-called competition with the private theater, the proposed Arts Foundation will not be interested in the big cities, where the commercial theater operates, but in the smaller communities, where it does not. The aim is to build up an audience away from New York—and a body of performers and creators—that will in the long run help the commercial theater.

In short, the Arts Foundation, which will not be controlled by a Federal bureaucracy but by distinguished private citizens active in the arts, will operate within the framework of private enterprise and voluntary association, strengthening and supplementing their efforts. It is our duty to help the living arts flourish at home so that they may flourish abroad, demonstrating to ourselves and the world the enlightenment and maturity we have and should enjoy.

We have already begun to recognize the fact that the world judges us as much by our culture as by our machinery, perhaps more so. The times are ripe for such an undertaking. Some Congressmen say that only 4 years ago they could not have supported an arts program without being laughed at back home. Practically nobody is laughing any more.

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vote on S. 57 earlier today, I am simply going to take about 2 minutes to make a matter of record facts pertinent to the housing legislation. Now that the action has been taken, it is ironical to note that there is today in the United States more than 6 percent vacancies in rental apartments and more than 1 percent in vacant houses. Percentage-wise these may seem like minute figures but actually the number of vacancies across this Nation are many times over the number of units which are provided for in this budget-busting legislation. What many of us think was more reasonable and rational legislation in this area met overwhelming opposition on this floor today.

Certainly, everyone is aware of the fact that the building of houses and apartments are proceeded on a larger scale this year than last year so that at the end of this year we will have an oversupply of housing in this country.

I just wonder if anyone has stopped to consider how many rental property owners will be caught squarely in the squeeze by the vacant housing units and skyrocketing real estate taxes.

Speaking for that part of my district which reaches into the city of Chicago, it is interesting to note that statistics show that in the metropolitan area permits alone last month were issued for 695,000 homes. The largest number for any 1 month since the boom month of April 1956.

In the city of Chicago, home and apartment construction during the past month showed gains of 97 percent over levels of 1 year ago. Apartment building permits alone in the city of Chicago last month were up 119 percent over a year ago.

The seasonally adjusted annual rate of Chicago area residential buildings last month climbed to a 1959 high of 62,285 units. Last year's actual production was 40,587 units and in the suburban area of Chicago apartment building has risen to an alltime high, while suburban home building soared sharply, too.

The April statistics show that suburban apartment building for the first 4 months of this year nearly doubled the number of the corresponding 1958 period.

In the face of these figures which I suspect are quite parallel to those of

other metropolitan areas, we bring forward the most extravagant housing bill in the history of this country.

I received a letter today from the Greater Chicago Property Owners Council presenting some of the figures I have cited and containing a warning of the squeeze in which property owners whose taxes support the necessary Government revenues face.

It just seems to me we have embarked on a binge to create surpluses of every nature and description from the farm to the cities and most everywhere in between and with each ambitious program we create greater fiscal deficits in the Federal Treasury. Now, if one of these days we dedicate our legislative activities to creating a little surplus in the Federal Treasury and applied it against the astronomical national debt, I am sure that many good folks in this country would enjoy a feeling of gratitude and security and, particularly, the folks on pensions and fixed incomes whom we stroke gently on one side of the face while firmly bashing them firmly on the other.

The Labor-Management Performance Act of 1959, H.R. 7265

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 20, 1959, I introduced my new labor bill, H.R. 7265. I am submitting herewith an explanation of this bill which I hope each and every Member of the Congress will read.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE ACT OF 1959—H.R. 7265

Weeks of hearings in the House, together with the public reaction against the Kennedy bill as passed by the Senate, demonstrate the need for a new approach to labor reform.

The heart of the problem is the breakdown in performance under existing laws. Whether the failure is in the law or its enforcement is an open question. The result is that the fundamental rights of the working men and women of this country definitely are not being protected.

The breakdown is most serious when it fails to provide protection against internal union abuses and to oust the criminal elements from the union movement. Union members can sometimes obtain relief from internal union problems through use of the courts, but it is a long and expensive process. Few rank and file union members can afford the time or the money. In the criminal area congressional hearings have clearly exposed an appalling failure of enforcement.

Nevertheless, the Senate act relies on court enforcement of its watered-down bill of rights and on criminal penalties for most of the rest of its provisions. Such legislation is no more than a repe-

tition of the same old theme song, "Let the House of Labor take care of itself."

H.R. 7265 offers a fresh approach. It is based on the recognition that, if the corrupt element is to be eliminated from the labor movement, the major part of the responsibility rests on the membership of any union to do its own house cleaning. They will do it if they are given the necessary tools and real protection while the job is being done. H.R. 7265 does exactly that.

The bill contains a simple but comprehensive bill of rights which will go a long way toward insuring that control of the union will be in the hands of the members rather than the officials. Independently audited financial reports are required, but the bill recognizes that regardless of where the reports are filed, only union members will be sufficiently well informed to question them. Thus it provides that the reports must be given to union members only. By far the great majority of union leaders and employers are honest Americans; therefore, no reports are required of labor officials or employers. Such reports are aimed only at wrongdoers, and it is ridiculous to think a criminal is going to write us a report of his crime.

Enforcement procedure is of paramount importance. H.R. 7265 contains a simple, well-tested method—the unfair labor practice procedure of the National Labor Relations Board. All the member need do is file a charge of a violation of the bill of rights or the reporting provisions, and the NLRB takes over the investigation and prosecution of his case. He is protected from retaliation while the case is processed. The confidence which rank-and-file workmen have in the Board is amply demonstrated by the fact that last quarter they filed 62 percent of the Board's unfair labor practice cases. The bill also includes important changes in Board structure to speed up its case handling.

Any labor reform measure must include restrictions on organizational picketing and secondary boycotts. Emotions run high on these issues, but both unions and employers are inclined to forget the impact of such activities on the working men and women who suffer as a result. Their right to be free of such coercion must be preserved if the freedom of association guaranteed by the Wagner Act is to mean anything.

H.R. 7265 prevents picketing after a union loses an NLRB election and, at the same time, markedly speeds up NLRB procedure for holding such elections. It also stops picketing where the labor organization involved cannot establish that 30 percent of the employees want the union to represent them.

In the secondary boycott area, there are presently restrictions on inducement of secondary employees. They are retained, and a ban on threats, restraint, and coercion of any person added. "Hot cargo" contracts are also outlawed.

The time has come to assure a greater voice to the union member in calling strikes. It is obvious that union officials must compete with each other to get the maximum wage increase for their members. Too often the members lose money

as a result, either from lost wages or inflation caused by the increase. Consequently, the bill provides for a secret ballot strike vote to be taken within 7 days prior to commencement of any strike.

There are many other provisions in the bill, which are explained in the following summary and explanation. They likewise provide practical methods of protecting the rights of individual workmen.

The Performance Act of 1959 is the least restrictive on the activities of legitimate unions of any bill presently before the House. It provides far fewer opportunities for harassment of honest unions. At the same time it provides the union member with the only practical, realistic method of enforcing his rights that can be found in any of the bills introduced.

SUMMARY AND EXPLANATION OF H.R. 7265—POLICY

Section 2. (a) The policy of Congress originally stated in the Wagner Act and in the Taft Hartley Act, is repeated. Briefly, it is to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and to protect the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

PERSONS SUBJECT TO RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Section 102. To assure uniform treatment of all union members, with a minimum of interference with existing law, persons subject to the Railway Labor Act are made subject to the bill of rights and reporting provisions only.

DEFINITION OF "LABOR ORGANIZATION"

Section 103(c). The definition of "labor organization" is amended to include intermediate labor bodies.

REVISION IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Section 104. The addition of new unfair labor practices will increase the caseload of the NLRB. To increase the Board's capacity and to provide faster processing of NLRB cases, three changes the NLRB structure are made:

First. Section 104(a): The Board is increased from five to seven members with terms of office increased to 7 years. The additional members will increase the capacity of the Board substantially by permitting use of more three-man panels.

Second. Section 104(b) (1): The Board is authorized to delegate to its regional directors the processing of representation cases. Such cases account for more than 50 percent of the Board's workload. During the early years of the NLRA, the Board undoubtedly needed to handle these cases itself. More than 20 years later the rules of decision are well established and nearly all of the cases are decided on established precedent. To make certain Board policy is followed by regional directors, provision is made for appeal to the Board. Action of the Director is not stayed pending the appeal, however, to avoid the taking of an appeal as a delaying technique. This

change of procedure will materially decrease the time spent in processing representation cases and eliminate advantages which parties have long sought to obtain by delays. It should therefore encourage consent elections and reduce the number of formal proceedings.

Third. Section 104(b)(2): The Board is made a truly quasi-judicial body and the General Counsel is made responsible for the administration of the agency. The estimated saving in Board workload is 15 percent. Historically, there has been serious conflict between the Board and the General Counsel sufficient to impair the efficiency of the agency. Most of the conflict has arisen over administrative matters. The proposed change will eliminate the major reason for disagreement and, with administrative responsibility centered in a single individual rather than in a group, a more efficient operation will result. Full control of all judicial functions of the Board, including its rulemaking power, remain with the Board.

Section 104(c): Provision is made for an Acting General Counsel. At present, certain functions of the General Counsel, including the issuing of complaints in unfair labor practice cases, cease when there is a vacancy in the office. The bill will permit appointment of an Acting General Counsel in order that the business of the agency may be carried on.

"HOT CARGO" CONTRACTS

Section 105(b). It is made an unfair labor practice for an employer to enter into any agreement, including a "hot cargo" contract, to engage in a secondary boycott.

UNION DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NONMEMBERS

Section 106(a): Although a strong bill of rights is included, the right of a union to refuse membership to persons it believes undesirable is recognized. An amendment to section 8(b)(2) of the LMRA precludes the union from causing an employer to discriminate against such persons.

SECONDARY BOYCOTT AMENDMENT

Section 106(b): The present language of section 8(b)(4) of the LMRA is left in effect and inducement of secondary employees continues to be an unfair labor practice. In addition, a ban is placed on "threats, coercion, or restraint" of any person where the object is one of those proscribed by section 8(b)(4) and contracts which cause an employer to engage in a secondary boycott are outlawed. Thus peaceful persuasion of secondary employers would be permitted but could not be carried to the point of threat or made part of a contract. The line drawn is the one between peaceful persuasion by the union and "strong arm" tactics.

ORGANIZATIONAL PICKETING

Section 107(b): Picketing to force an employer to recognize or bargain with a union after the union has lost an NLRB election is banned by amending section 8(b)(4)(C) of the LMRA. The amendment would permit picketing prior to the election except where the union is unable to establish that 30 percent of the employees affected want the union to represent them. As in the case of the

secondary boycott amendment, the line drawn is that between peaceful persuasion and force. Picketing prevented by the amendment has but one effect. That is to force employees to accept as their bargaining agent a union which they have shown they do not want. Whatever educational value the picket line has is, at that point, far outweighed by its coercive effect on the employees and its interference with their freedom not to associate for collective-bargaining purposes, a freedom which Congress has specifically guaranteed in section 7 of the LMRA.

ENFORCEMENT OF BILL OF RIGHTS AND REPORTING PROVISIONS

Section 104(c): Violations of the bill of rights and the reporting provisions of the Performance Act are enforced through the unfair labor practice procedure of the National Labor Relations Board. As stated previously, inadequate performance under existing law is a large part of today's labor reform problem. Many, if not most, of the evils sought to be corrected can be reached through criminal laws or by private civil suits. Neither remedy is of real practical value to the rank-and-file union member. For conviction, a crime must be proved "beyond a reasonable doubt." Because of this burden, enforcement officials will try only clear-cut cases. Few cases are clear where, as here, so many witnesses are afraid to testify.

In the past the right to civil remedies, while helpful in some instances, has been beyond the reach of the average workman because of the cost. He cannot afford to hire a lawyer and go through the long procedures necessary, particularly when he must first exhaust his internal remedies within the union which may take years in itself.

The unfair labor practice procedure is a much more practical method of enforcement. It is thoroughly tested in the courts, eliminating procedural uncertainty. It can be uniformly applied because, even while the substance of the new unfair practices is being tested, a uniform policy will be followed. The injunctive remedy is available but, based on past experience, the Board can be expected to use it very sparingly. Also, if used, a uniform policy may be expected. While the Board has very broad powers to tailor remedies to correct unfair labor practices, it does not award damages. Cases instituted for harassment purposes will be inexpensively disposed of through the power of the general counsel to refuse issuance of a complaint.

The individual workman will clearly benefit by use of the unfair labor practice procedure. Where he believes he has been wronged, he need only file a charge with NLRB and the expense of investigating and processing will be borne by the Government. He will also have the power of the Government to protect him and any witnesses who testify for him from retaliation. NLRB's interest will be in securing relief as quickly and effectively as possible, preferably by settlement.

Enforcement by the Secretary of Labor was considered unwise for two

major reasons. First, an entirely new enforcement agency within the Department would have to be established and its procedures tested in the courts—an expensive, time-consuming process. Second, it is unsound to ask the Cabinet Member whose real function it is to cooperate and work with labor to be a policeman over labor. If factionalism in the labor movement were to increase, a Secretary sympathetic to one faction could seriously harass the other.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY PROVISIONS

Section 107(a), (b) amends section 9(c)(1) of the NLRA to permit prehire contracts in the building and construction industry. Two safeguards are included: (1) There must have been a history of collective bargaining, and (2) if more than 30 percent of the employees in the bargaining unit object, an election will be held.

Because of the temporary nature of employment in this industry, the election provisions of the NLRA have not been practical. Employers and unions have been forced into technical violations of present unfair labor practice law, but no general counsel of NLRB has issued complaints in such cases, recognizing the equities involved. For the protection of all concerned, however, the law should be changed.

Permitting such prehire agreements handles the problem but, if employees are to be protected in the freedom guaranteed by the act, the two safeguards are essential. With no history of bargaining required and no chance for the employees to object, the "sweetheart" contract could effectively be used in many areas where there are substantial numbers of nonunion workmen. It will not interfere with established building trades unions because they have acquired the necessary history and an overwhelming number of members of the bargaining units are loyal union members.

ECONOMIC STRIKERS

Section 107(c). Economic strikers not entitled to reinstatement are permitted to vote in NLRB elections for a period of 6 months. A cutoff date has been used to avoid problems of former employees continuing to return indefinitely to influence the results of elections. The 6-month limit is believed to be adequate to cover any but most unusual situations.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 9(F) AND (G) OF LMRA

Section 107(d) repeals the reporting requirements of section 9(f) and (g) of the LMRA. This section required reports of union constitutions, bylaws, etc., and of financial transactions. No reports to the Secretary of Labor are required by the Performance Act and there are no prerequisites to use of NLRB. In the past, these reports have been of little, if any, value and provide many possibilities for raising procedural technicalities in NLRB cases.

NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVITS

Section 107(d) repeals the requirement of filing non-Communist affidavits as a prerequisite to use of NLRB. While this section may have served a

useful function at one time, its advantages at present are far outweighed by its disadvantages. The present requirement can be used as a procedural device to interfere with NLRB processes. The clerical problems in handling the paperwork are many and expensive. To add an employer requirement of such affidavits would be of no practical value and would merely increase the waste of money and effort. The problem of ousting Communists from the union movement is handled by a criminal provision in section 308.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGES

Section 108 contains necessary amendments to section 10 of the NLRA. Present law permits any person to file an unfair labor practice charge. To avoid possible use for harassment, the amendment limits to the members of the particular labor organization charged the right to file a charge of violation of the reporting provisions. The amendment further requires that, upon notification of filing of the charge, reports which were furnished to members under the reporting provisions must be furnished to the general counsel with an affidavit certifying their accuracy. To protect rank-and-file members, the identity of the charging party in such cases will not be disclosed without his permission.

BILL OF RIGHTS

Testimony of rank-and-file union members before both the McClellan Committee and the House Education and Labor Committee clearly demonstrates the need for clarify the rights of union members within their own labor organizations. While the great majority of unions and union officials are a credit to the labor movement, a small fringe of dishonest and corrupt officials have seriously interfered with the rights of individual workmen.

Section 109 provides a simple, yet effective, statement of the basic rights which union members should have. It preserves to the union, however, an unlimited right to deny membership regardless of reason. The rights listed will not interfere with the operation of legitimate unions but will provide members with the means to rid themselves of dishonest officials. It should be borne in mind that this section will be enforced through the NLRB unfair labor practice procedure. Therefore, some of the requirements are not set forth as precisely as in other bills introduced. NLRB, as an administrative agency, can take into consideration all of the facts and circumstances in a particular case and determine whether the rights of the individuals have been impaired. In other words, the agency can assess the conduct in the light of the surrounding circumstances and within the guidelines laid down in the section.

Section 20(1) requires each labor organization to have a constitution and bylaws.

Section 20(2) guarantees the right of free speech and assembly within the union subject to reasonable restrictions.

Section 20(3) guarantees every member equal rights within his union.

Section 20(4) guarantees the members adequate notice and a chance to vote on all matters pertaining to dues and initiation fees.

Section 20(5) protects the members in the right to use the courts and administrative agencies without retaliation.

Section 20(6) guarantees due process to members charged with violations of union rules.

Section 20(7) requires that each member of a bargaining unit be furnished a copy of the collective bargaining agreement.

Section 20(8) bans the use of union dues for political purposes within the union or in the election of public officials.

Section 20(9) guarantees members against threats or acts of violence by any other member.

Section 20(10) prevents employer delay in forwarding checked-off dues from being used to discriminate against members.

Section 20(11) guarantees free and uncoerced election of union officers while still providing labor organizations with flexibility in establishing their own election procedures to meet their individual requirements.

Section 20(12) assures members of a bargaining unit of a secret ballot strike vote within 7 days prior to the commencement of the strike.

Section 20(13) guarantees fair and just administration of trusteeships while permitting flexibility in their operation and length of existence.

Section 20(14) establishes the fiduciary character of union officers with regard to union funds.

Section 20(15) safeguards union funds by requiring bonds of those handling union moneys.

REPORTS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Section 109, section 21 sets forth the reporting requirements of the bill. These are that labor organizations report only to their members, not to the public or any agency.

The Senate bill and all bills previously introduced in the House have required labor organizations to submit detailed reports to the Secretary of Labor and for him to make public disclosure of the reports. Such requirements will be of limited value in labor reform and will provide a prolific source of harassment of unions in their legitimate activities. A union's primary responsibility is to its members and they in turn should have primary responsibility for seeing that it operates in accordance with their desires and within the framework of law. While unions also have a duty to the public because of their broad impact on the activities of every individual, this duty does not require that every act must be disclosed or explained to the public. Only the members are entitled to such information.

The reports in other bills are comprehensive and will probably number in the hundreds of thousands. It would be most unrealistic to think that any Federal agency or department would be able adequately to analyze the reports and determine which are questionable. From a practical standpoint, the enforcement agency will have to be altered to investi-

gate particular reports, and it is only reasonable to expect that the impetus in such cases will uniformly be from interested members of the organization. Even public disclosure will be of little value to other than the members. Only they are likely to have sufficient knowledge of the true facts to raise questions concerning the reports.

Therefore, reports to the members will provide those who must raise questions of impropriety with necessary information. And the unfair labor practice machinery will provide a simple, inexpensive method by which an investigation may be set in motion. At the same time, reports to members only will require the great majority of unions to do nothing more than they do at present. These are the honest, properly conducted unions. There is no reason for the public or a Federal agency to become involved with their internal affairs.

Section 21(a) sets forth general information which the union must provide to its members, including lists of officers, amount of fees, and complete information on internal union procedures and rights of members.

Section 21(b) requires that the information be kept current.

Section 21(c) lists the financial information which the union must supply to the members.

Section 21(d) requires that copies of the foregoing reports, together with the union constitution and bylaws, must be furnished to the members.

Section 21(e) provides that the labor organization must keep for 5 years records on which the reports are based and must make them reasonably available to members.

VIOLATIONS OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Section 109, section 22. While the principal method of enforcing the reporting requirements is through the NLRB, criminal provisions are also included in the case of knowing and willful violations. This section, a counterpart of which can be found in all of the bills introduced, is designed to be used in those few cases where the violations are so flagrant as to make a criminal remedy the only practical method of terminating the conduct permanently.

NONEXCLUSIVENESS OF REMEDIES

Section 109 includes an amendment to the LMRA (sec. 23) which provides that the rights and remedies included in the bill of rights and reporting provisions are in addition to any existing rights and remedies. If present remedies were adequate this bill would, of course, be unnecessary. The purpose of the bill is to add, rather than take away, protection for the individual worker. Therefore, Congress should not, as a part of the bill, impair present remedies.

PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES

Section 110, amends the LMRA to make it unlawful for an employer, directly or indirectly, to pay off (1) any representative of his employees, (2) any person or organization seeking to represent his employees, (3) any employee to influence other employees in the exercise of their rights to deal collectively, and (4) any union official with the intent to

influence him in his capacity as a representative of the union. It is also made unlawful for any person to seek such a pay off.

This provision is intended to prevent sweetheart agreements and other types of payments which interfere with employee rights. It goes to one of the serious evils disclosed by the McClellan committee.

EXTORTION PICKETING

Section 110 also makes extortion picketing a crime. Such conduct is already an unfair labor practice but, because of the criminal nature of the conduct, the provision is added.

EMBEZZLEMENT

Section 110 (sec. 306) makes embezzlement of union funds a Federal crime.

LOANS TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Section 110 (sec. 307) also forbids loans in excess of \$5,000 by a union to its officers or employees, and by an employer to a representative of his employees in any amount. Such loans have been demonstrated to be one of the most common devices for abuse by criminal elements in unions and in union-employer relations.

EX-CONVICTS AND COMMUNISTS BARRED FROM UNION OFFICE

Section 110 (sec. 308) prohibits any person convicted of a felony at any time within the previous 5 years from serving as a union official. The section is intended as a further step in ridding the union movement of the criminal element which has crept into a few unions. It also bars Communists from holding union office.

NO MAN'S LAND

Section 112 permits State or Territorial courts or agencies to exercise jurisdiction over labor disputes regardless of the jurisdiction of NLRB unless there is a direct and positive conflict between the Federal and State or Territorial law. Where the Board declines to assert jurisdiction, a State or Territorial court or agency has jurisdiction irrespective of such conflict.

Tributes to George E. Stringfellow, Imperial Potentate of the Shrine of North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, on last March 9 a former colleague of ours here in the Senate, Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey, gave a reception and dinner in honor of the Imperial Potentate of the Shrine of North America, Sir George E. Stringfellow, at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel here in Washington.

Senator Hawkes tried to have all the Masons and Shriners in both branches of Congress present, but the pressure of

business permitted only 58 Members of the House and approximately 23 Members of the Senate to be present with many of the outstanding officers of the Masonic fraternity and the Shrine throughout the United States. In Senator Hawkes' invitation he recounted that he had become a Mason at 71 years of age and a Shriner at 72, and while in the Senate he was impressed by the fact that George Washington was a devout Mason and gave much credit to his teachings in Masonry for the maintenance of principle on the battlefield and in public office. It was recounted that a majority of all those who signed the Declaration of Independence were Masons, and a majority of those who signed the Constitution of the United States were Masons, and his theory was that inasmuch as our Masonic forefathers had so much to do with the creation of our American form of liberty and opportunity, perhaps we, as the benefactors of their work, might do our share in helping to preserve our American constitutional government and way of life.

Briefly, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Shriners Crippled Children's Hospitals draw no lines based on color, race or creed in their splendid work to help those with physical infirmities get the most possible out of life.

Senator Hawkes tells me he has in mind bringing together all of the Masonic and Shrine Members of the Congress and many of those in the Executive and Judicial branches of our Government once a year in the hope that this group of well-intentioned citizens can be of greater benefit in their public services to the Nation and every group of citizens composing it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the minutes of the dinner in honor of the Imperial Potentate of the Shrine of North America, Sir George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although it is estimated by the Public Printer to be over two pages and will cost \$283.25 to insert.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECEPTION AND DINNER GIVEN MARCH 9, 1959, IN HONOR OF THE IMPERIAL POTENTATE OF THE SHRINE OF NORTH AMERICA, SIR GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, AT THE SHERATON-CARLTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Will you all please stand for the invocation by my very dear friend, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate? I want to say about Dr. Harris that our friendship has been one of the choice things in my life. I consider him one of the most unselfish ambassadors of Christ on earth and one of God's chosen servants. He is also a Mason and has been a working Knight Templar for years. Dr. Harris, will you please offer the invocation?

DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS. Let us lift our hearts in prayer. Our Father, God, who hath made and preserved us a Nation, our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded. In Thee we trust. Thou hast made us to love truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free, free from pride and prejudice and from all the ugliness of disposition that does so easily beset us.

Lift us, we pray Thee, above the mud and scum of mere things with the holiness of Thy beauty so that even the common task and the trivial may be trimmed with crimson and gold. Lead us in Thy paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake.

Enrich us, we pray Thee, with those durable satisfactions of life so the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in those things that matter most, the golden currency of faith and hope and love.

In these desperate and dangerous days, when the precious things we hold nearest in our hearts are threatened by sinister forces without pity or without conscience, help us to give the best that is in us against the wrongs that need resistance and for the right that needs assistance and to the future in the distance and the good that we may do.

We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Now, gentlemen, will you please remain standing for just a moment while we have the national anthem?

(The assembly joined in singing the national anthem.)

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Be seated, gentlemen.

(The assembly was seated and dinner was served.)

(Selections by the quartet of Crescent Temple.)

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Gentlemen, I was supposed to say a few words of welcome, but I thought that everybody acted so much at home that it wasn't necessary. [Applause.] I do want to say this: that I am particularly happy that you very busy men, who have great burdens on your shoulders (and I know something about them) have seen fit to come out tonight to honor our distinguished imperial potentate, Sir George E. Stringfellow, of the Shrine of North America. [Applause.]

Now I know you don't want to hear very much from me, but I must say this: that I hope the fact that we can come here as free men tonight shows, regardless of what party we belong to, or what our ideas regarding some of the chosen representatives of the American Government may be, still we are free agents to come and go as we choose and show to each other brotherly love and consideration. I hope the fact that you can do that will never be out of your minds when you are voting and working to keep good in the saddle as against evil that is trying to control the world. I want you to know that I think we are living in the greatest country that God ever helped man to develop, and I trust that no man in our Congress will ever fail to have the courage to vote to preserve the American system of free men. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

(Selections by the quartet of Crescent Temple.) [Applause.]

HON. B. CARROLL REECE. Mr. Chairman, may I offer a toast? We have great men in public life and private life. In public life we have none greater than Albert W. Hawkes, who served so faithfully and devotedly in the U.S. Senate for what made America great; and in private life we have none who has served his country more faithfully and devotedly than our imperial potentate, Sir George E. Stringfellow, and to the Masons and Shriners and their purposes of good will to all mankind.

(The assembly participated in the toast.)

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Thank you very much, my friend CARROLL, for your fine toast.

Senator MUNDT, would you like to make a few remarks now? If you would, I invite you to the microphone. KARL, what you say is worth hearing, and I would like to have you come up here. [Applause.]

HON. KARL E. MUNDT. Our genial and beloved host Al, and imperial sir, this is indeed a surprise to me, but I have never yet known a Senator who would decline the op-

portunity to say a few words. Usually we like to get the food before we talk, because then we are sure of being fed, but it is a pleasure to address such a distinguished group at any time.

I would like to say for those assembled, if I may speak for you all, that this is in many ways one of the most delightful occasions that I have been able to attend for a long time. It is good to be here with Al Hawkes and his good neighbor, who have no axes to grind and who would like to have the same America we all believe in. I think it is nice to come out to a banquet and not be pressured in this direction or that direction, but just be with good fellows who are enjoying good fellowship and who, being members of the shrine, as we are, have this opportunity to pay a tribute to the imperial potentate whom we have all watched through the many years that one has to go through the chairs before he reaches that distinguished position.

I have met George Stringfellow many times as I have traveled around the States trading a cool speech for a cold steak. I met him in Shreveport and all through the South. To me he typifies what the shrine stands for, that wonderful spirit of comradeship, that genuine affection for his fellow man. He carries out that concept for which Shriners stand with great credit to our craft.

So, Al, I want to thank you as one member of this company for your thoughtfulness in inviting us to meet and pay our respects to a man who is doing a great job as the head of a great organization.

I have known George Stringfellow and his wife for a long time, and it has been my privilege to visit with him in his home.

I know he is respected in his hometown, as he is throughout shrinedom, as a man with the courage of his convictions and a man whose convictions can always be found on the right side as far as the concept of preservation of America is concerned.

Thank you for the privilege of saying what I have felt for a long time. I never expect to be surrounded by two better Americans than Al Hawkes and George Stringfellow. [Applause.]

Senator HAWKES. I know the Imperial Potentate joins me in thanks to you for your fine remarks.

(Selections by the quartet of Crescent Temple). [Applause]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. I am going to ask my very good friend, Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, if he would like to make a few comments—you can say the limit about our good friend, the imperial potentate. [Applause.]

Hon. BOURKE HICKENLOOPER. Noble Al, Imperial Sir, Al came around just a moment ago and asked if I would like to say a few words. I said, "Not necessarily." He said, "Would you?" And I said, "Yes."

This gathering tonight is a meeting of people who are dedicated not only fraternally but politically, regardless of partisan politics, to the preservation of the American system of government, and I think it is remarkable. A great patriot once said, "My country, may she always be right but right or wrong, my country." I think those of us who are gathered here under the banner of the Mystic Shrine may say, "My politics, may they always be right, but right or wrong, may they lead to the preservation of my country." This is the thing we hold most dear.

Tonight I am delighted to be here, and not only be with my dear and noble friend, Al Hawkes, who is one of the most dedicated Americans I have ever known, but to be with Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow whose acquaintance and friendship I have enjoyed for a good many years. To all of you, I say that the renewal of this fraternal association, which most of us renew so infrequently, is a stimulus and a pleasure. Al, all I can say

is that I, for one, thank you for this opportunity to meet with George Stringfellow, with you, and with the others who have made the Mystic Shrine one of the greatest humanitarian organizations that the country knows. Thank you. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. BOURKE, we all appreciate very much your kind and thoughtful remarks.

Now my very dear friend, a Democrat—I have some very good friends who are Democrats—Senator JOHN SPARKMAN is going to say a few words from the South, which is in my opinion, one of the finest American sections of the United States that we have left. Thank God we have the South. [Cheers and applause.] I am talking right from the heart now. I think we ought to thank God that we have the Americanism that is in the South of this country. I don't say the South is always right, but I do think the South has as many and as deep convictions of the fine things of the American system of freemen and our constitutional form of government, as we can expect to find anywhere in our country.

Senator SPARKMAN, come up here, will you? [Applause.]

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN. Thank you, Al Hawkes. I am delighted to have this opportunity, but I want to explain one thing before I start. There is one reservation I have about making this speech. He said, "Just a few words." We southerners don't accept a speech on that basis.

I think it is a great occasion to be here tonight. I was delighted when I had a letter from Al Hawkes some time ago telling of his plan to set up this get together honoring our imperial potentate, whom we are glad to have with us tonight. By the way, Al, he is a great southerner from the State of Virginia. Of course, I have no idea of drawing the line tonight. I am just carrying out what you suggested by your remarks. There is no line with Shriners.

I had the pleasure of serving in the Senate with Al Hawkes. He sat on the other side of the aisle, but I never knew a person of greater integrity or finer friendship than this man from New Jersey. By the way, I can tell you a little practical incident that happened after he got out of the Senate. One day I had a telephone call from him while I was down in Huntsville, and he asked me about a little business in my part of the State. The business was in trouble, and somehow it had gotten to him; I don't know how. Well, he pulled it out of the ditch and it is doing all right today.

It is great to be here tonight. By the way, we from Alabama are particularly pleased to have here with us the imperial chief rabban, George Mattison, and the imperial captain of the guard, Orville Rush, so I think we are doing pretty well in this line up.

I am glad to be here to pay tribute to George Stringfellow and the tremendous job that he has been doing as imperial potentate. We are delighted to be with you. We are glad to have this chance to be with one another without any mention of legislation. You know, the only word I heard about legislation I got when I rounded the table down there, and it was from EVERETT DIRKSEN whispering to me. He didn't want me to take advantage of this microphone on some of the things we have been talking about on the Senate floor. But it is great to be here, and I appreciate the privilege of being with you.

By the way, a toast was drunk to our imperial potentate. That reminded me of an incident when I was in London one time with a small group. We were having a little luncheon in London County. We had this master of ceremonies, a great stately fellow. He had a great time announcing us every time, but he was scared to death that these Americans were going to smoke before the King had been toasted. Well, he managed to keep them from smoking, but just as

quick as the King was toasted he made this announcement: "Ladies and gentlemen, the King being drunk, you can smoke." So George Stringfellow "has been drunk."

I would like to propose a toast, if I may, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask you to lift your glasses and drink with me to the hundreds of thousands of crippled children who are receiving benefits by reason of the existence of our organization and the great leadership of Imperial George Stringfellow.

Thank you, sir. [Applause.]

(The assembly joined in the toast.)

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. JOHN, both the imperial potentate and I thank you very much, and we are very happy you are here tonight, very happy. [Applause.]

(Selections by the quartet from Crescent Temple.) [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. I want to thank the quartet from Crescent Temple of Trenton for the rendition of these fine songs, and tell them how much I think they have added to our pleasures.

Gentlemen, I want to introduce one of our most distinguished Members of the Congress of the United States, a man who is chairman of one of the most important committees in the House of Representatives, the Appropriations Committee, CLARENCE CANNON, from the wonderful State of Missouri, which attracted me enough so I went down there and found a bride almost 58 years ago. She and I will have been together 58 years on the 15th of the coming May, if we are both alive at that time.

There is a strange thing about Missourians. They never forget each other. If you once know them, you will always like them.

So, CLARENCE CANNON, I am going to ask you if you would like to say something about our fine imperial potentate, and the wonderful shrine which has contributed so much to the welfare of those who are afflicted. Mr. CANNON. [Applause.]

VOICES. Our chairman. [Laughter.]

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON. Mr. Toastmaster, and if I may paraphrase Senator MUNDY's salutation, my lightheaded and lightheaded friends:

It is always a pleasure to salute the nobility. And it is a special privilege tonight on this happy occasion as the guest of Noble Hawkes and in honor of the imperial potentate of the Mystic Shrine. Sir George E. Stringfellow is not only the imperial potentate of the Mystic Shrine, but he is one of the profound philosophers and one of the greatest philanthropists of our times.

Among the many notable and extraordinary things about our host is that he became a Mason when he was 71 years old. I think he is the only man I have ever known in my life who has that distinction. I trust every member here tonight will be present when we award him his 50-year pin.

You know, Al, Mr. Toastmaster, the Shrine is the playground of masonry, but even the Shrine has its serious side and its inalienable responsibilities. Just now we are at a critical period in national affairs, a critical time in world affairs, requiring the thoughtful attention of noble and brother.

For there is one thing about freemasonry, freemasonry never dodges an issue. You always know where freemasonry stands. In time of greatest stress its lights burn brightest. There can be no doubt as to where freemasonry stands on world issues at this critical time—a time at which we may expect every man to stand up and be counted.

Every dictator who has sought to establish a despotism has initiated his campaign by destroying all local units of Freemasonry. Hitler drove Freemasonry from Germany and Mussolini exterminated every Freemason he could lay hands upon. Hitler and Mussolini have passed on—and with them the tyrannical dynasties which they created. But Freemasonry still stands a power and an influence for democracy and freedom.

Washington enlisted the benevolent and majestic influence of Freemasonry and established the greatest Nation and most enduring civilization of all time.

You will be interested to know that at the Capitol today we uncovered the cornerstone of the Capitol laid by Brother George Washington with Masonic ceremonies. You may be certain, Brother Toastmaster, that we depend on you and our imperial potentate as sentinels and guardians on the watchtowers of Freemasonry, who like the keepers of Israel neither slumber nor sleep.

Whether through the vicissitudes of the day or across the burning sands of the desert, we know we may follow you safely and securely. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. We appreciate your very fine remarks, and I am very happy that you have emphasized what would happen to Freemasonry and the Shrine if dictators and slavedrivers are ever allowed to take over the control of world affairs. Our deep thanks to you for giving up this evening to be with us, CLARENCE CANNON.

We have at this table a man whom I have known for many years, and with whom I served in the U.S. Senate for 6 years. I think he exemplifies America at its best. I am one of those who believes an American who is conservative enough to try and save his country as an example to the rest of the world of what freedom under God can do, is a liberal. We call a lot of people liberals but I think of true Americans as liberals in the interest of the freedom of man.

STYLES BRIDGES is the senior Republican Senator in the U.S. Senate at the present time. He is a very dear friend of mine, and I am one of the fellows who is only 80 years old, but is going to work as hard as I can to keep him where he is as long as he is willing to serve and sacrifice, as he is doing. [Applause.]

I would like my dear friend, STYLES BRIDGES, to say a few words about our imperial potentate. [Applause.]

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES. Mr. Toastmaster, it is a pleasure for me to be here this evening to say a few words on this occasion, not only in tribute to our imperial potentate, but also to our host of the evening.

Our host, Al Hawkes, is one of the men who was wise enough to retire from public life to spend some time enjoying himself, after devoting years of service to his country in the U.S. Senate. He has continued, however, to work for his country which he loves so much. Most Senators, as you know, stay in the Senate until they are either defeated or have to be carried out. He is one of the rare exceptions to the rule. Al is a great patriot. He is one of the great patriots of our time.

Now, as to our imperial potentate, Sir George Stringfellow, he is a man who has been successful in business. In recent years, he has devoted more and more of his time to civic and fraternal affairs, and he has made great contributions to Masonry.

You and I know the most important thing to every American today is the survival of this Nation. Freemasonry had a great deal to do with the building of this Nation in the early days. George Stringfellow is the type of leader in Masonry and in the Shrine who is attempting to continue the same patriotic spirit established by our early brothers and built upon a sturdy foundation.

I think it is fitting for the Members of Congress of the United States, of both political parties, of both Houses of Congress, to come here this evening to pay tribute to this great Masonic leader, the Imperial Potentate of the Shrine, and to one of the most beloved patriots of America, our host, Al Hawkes. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. STYLES, I thank you very much. You know, it isn't too often that a fellow, who can't help standing for what he believes in, gets any plaudits or accolades from anybody, so I deeply appreciate

those kind remarks and I am sure the imperial potentate, George Stringfellow, appreciates them also.

We have with us tonight Justice Tom C. Clark, of the Supreme Court of the United States, whom I considered one of my good friends when I was serving here in the U.S. Senate, for he was trying to keep corporations functioning in line with legal requirements and fair American practice. We are highly honored that he would give up an evening in a busy life to pay his respects to the imperial potentate, and as an old friend of mine, I am going to call upon him to make a few remarks relative to Shrinedom and our imperial potentate. Hon. Mr. Justice Tom C. Clark. [Applause.]

Mr. Justice TOM C. CLARK. Senator Hawkes, my good friend and brother Shriner, George Stringfellow, and fellow Masons. Unaccustomed to public speaking as I am after a decade on the Court, I cannot forego this opportunity afforded by our genial host to say a few words concerning our guest of honor. In so doing, I break a long precedent started when I went on the Bench; namely, to be a good listener. The Lord gave us two ears and but one tongue so we might listen twice while talking once. Perhaps the world would be happier if each of us had the same capacity for silence as we have for speech. Thomas Vaux put it clearly when he said, "He speaks best that hath the skill when for to hold his peace."

In fact, our honored guest, our imperial potentate, was reared in that school. Taught by the great inventor, Thomas A. Edison, with whom he was associated at Menlo Park, he has practiced the true virtues. Edison, Brother Stringfellow tells me, was a man of few words devoting some 18 to 20 hours of each day to the development of discoveries that brought much to his fellow man. He instilled in our honored guest this indefatigability for work and so today he devotes long and arduous hours to the betterment of our democratic system. In this he is but the chosen instrument of the thousands of us brothers who have crossed the sands and entered the mystic order. It is said that we are but the playground of Masonry, but if that be so, our answer is that it is there that most of life's lessons are learned. The rules of the playground soon become the laws of men, and if we have learned our lesson well in the first, it follows—as the night the day—that we will obey those of the latter. Our distinguished guest well knows this for today he tours the country as a crusader for our democratic form of government as contrasted with that of the totalitarian Soviet. His message has been one of devotion to our principles, or understanding of the realities of life today and the use of a firm hand and determined mind in protecting ourselves from such destructive forces.

Personally, I have learned much from Masonry. In its deep reverence for those spiritual values that weave the tapestry of our life together it places the strong cord of respect for constituted authority so necessary in the attainment of that ordered liberty to which we aspire. In the inner sanctum of my being it has placed a seed, that of understanding—understanding for human souls—and in so doing, it has taught me how we may obtain for each of them that freedom and justice the attainment of which brought our country into being. It is in this effort that I am happiest and in it that I am most serviceable.

And so to the success of your crusade, Imperial Potentate, Sir George Stringfellow, we drink; to your continued good health each of us brings our prayers; and to that ordered liberty which you support we lend our arms in firm salute. So mote it always be. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Thank you for your fine remarks, Mr. Justice Clark. I don't know very much about Washington any more, but I heard from a lady, who knew you

were going to be here tonight, that you were doing a great and effective work in connection with the Patrick Henry Clubs. I congratulate you on this work.

Now, I am going to call on Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN to say a few words. He is from Illinois, the State of my birth, you know. EVERETT, come up here where we can see and hear you. [Applause.]

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN. My old friend, Al Hawkes, fellow Democrats—and I should make special reference to my old friends, CLARENCE CANNON and JOHN SPARKMAN—I am delighted to be here as your guest. I just asked Eddie Rickenbacker how long you might want to be here, before I rose to my feet, and he said, "Not too long, why?" I replied, "Because I thought I might make a speech on housing or some other appropriate subject."

Al—and I like to call you Al, it is truly a delight to be here as your guest. I was a sort of freshman tenderfoot when I came to the Senate and you were still here. As a pupil I used to sit at the feet of the master—meaning you—and imbibe wisdom and understanding in the hope that I would follow a proper and durable path.

I used to sit at the feet of my old friend, STYLES BRIDGES also, who is here tonight. He is our senior Republican in the Senate and a great citizen. I probably have been in the Congress a little longer but STYLES is our ranking Republican. He is such a two-fisted American that he deserves a big hand. [Applause.]

I could wax quite philosophical tonight and especially so when Dr. Harris, the Senate Chaplain, is here. What an inspiration it is to hear his invocational prayers when the Senate session opens each day. On occasions some people become cynical about the opening prayer, as indicated by the old story of a father and his young son in the Gallery. The son inquired of the father who the man was standing up before the Senate and his father said, "That is the Chaplain," and then added, "He takes a look at the Senate and then prays for the country."

Such are the moods of cynicism that sometimes engulf us, and over and over we must search for appropriate and durable answers. I find much of the answer in what I have received from Masonic teachings. In a way, I am not too good a Mason in the sense that I have not attended Blue Lodge for a long time. Manifestly, long sessions in Washington make it difficult to attend lodge back home. I try to make up for it by going to the Grand Masters' meetings which are held here and to neighboring Blue Lodges in the hope that I can expiate and wash out the sins of neglect.

When I reflect on what I have gotten out of the Masonic Order it goes back to one fundamental principle, and that is that the hope of the universe and the hope of society reposes in the individual, in his integrity, his dignity, his peace of mind and the power that he can wield in the area where he lives and serves.

A great many years ago a visiting chaplain came to open a session of the House of Representatives. His prayer impressed me. I made inquiries about him. They said his name was Joshua Liebman, a Jewish rabbi from Boston. He was then only 43. I visited with him. About 10 days later while in Chicago my eye caught the title of a book in a bookshop by Joshua Liebman. The title was "Peace of Mind." In the very first pages of the first chapter Rabbi Liebman spoke of an old, distinguished rabbi who had been sought out by a younger man who was so ill at ease and uneasy about the world. He had certain objectives in life. The good rabbi told him to make out a list, which he did. Together they examined the list and after a time the old rabbi struck out every item, such as fame, security, acquisition, glory, and at the bottom he wrote one great, golden

and glorious objective, and that was peace of mind.

How does one achieve peace of mind? I believe one gets it best through service to his fellow men. That goes right back to the individual. What else is there when all is said and done? The individual in his community from the days of his youth, the radiance and influence which he can shed, his exemplification of the teachings of our craft, becomes a massive radiating force that goes out into the community even as common coronary attacks quickly race into the arms and legs of one who suffers this distress.

Every day we read of someone, especially people close to us, who have had a heart attack. Just what does happen? It is rather simple. Something touches that life-giving pump and pains begin to radiate into the members of the body. There is pain and agony, and it is this little difference, this little affliction to the pump, to the auricles and ventricles that spells the difference between life and death.

The individual in his relation to the social system and for that matter to the whole country and the whole world is like that. One person radiating and exemplifying in the community where he lives the things he absorbed in the lodge room and the amplification of the teachings which he gathers as he goes along life's course does become the last and best and noblest hope of mankind.

Think of the things that men have tried to reduce to paper in the form of treaties and agreements and sanctions and codes of conduct and ethical standards in the hope that leaders in their thoughts and actions everywhere would respond to this kind of discipline.

The arch leader of the Soviet Union, Nikita Khrushchev, is a case in point. Only late this afternoon the press called me for comment on the fact that Khrushchev has changed his mind again. His latest fulmination seems to be that he was willing to guarantee the security of Berlin either through the troops of neutral nations or the troops of major nations acting in concert. It was the seventh or eighth time that he has changed his mind in recent weeks.

Somehow in our search for peace in the world we constantly go back to a personality in whose actions and words there reposes not only much of peace for mankind, but whether there will be a thaw in the cold war.

This in itself should be a great lesson for us who are identified with a craft that goes back to Hiram Abiff. Each of us in one dimension or another, and in one degree or another, can by exerting the power of influence and personality, condition the communities where he lives and radiate a degree of integrity and confidence which must manifest itself upon his fellow beings.

At the convention in Chicago in 1952 a thought came into my mind. It was from Solomon. He was supplicating the Lord and the greatest thing he asked was this. He said, "Give them Thy servants an understanding heart." The understanding heart is but a part of individual equipment. In proportion as we understand and reflect that understanding, we become tremendously influential in the reconstruction of society and the reconstruction of the world.

In our search for words to put on pieces of parchment in the hope that the desirable objectives so uttered may not be ephemeral and a vain thing, we must never forget that salvation in every facet of human experience goes back to the simple fundamentals of our craft because all of the emphasis is on the individual and his constant efforts at perfection.

Illustrious Imperial Potentate, that is what I got in the simplest unit of our craft; namely, the Blue Lodge. I came to Washington 25 years ago with several suitcases full of clothes and a suitcase full of ideals. The clothes have long disappeared and

changed and been replaced. I feel pretty sure that the ideals are still intact, and among the ideals is this abiding and constant conviction that the salvation of the universe leads to the door of the individual. How else shall we regenerate society, except to start with a nucleus, and that nucleus is the individual? There is in him a spiritual nuclear power of undreamed influence and effect.

At the grand masters' breakfast meeting one morning recently, I mentioned that 19 centuries ago there was a great light in the sky as a star directed humble people. It was early in the morning, when there was a touch of darkness. That light directed the shepherds to the manger where that great event, the birth of Christ, took place. Ever since then He has, through His teachings, His disciples, and His followers, shed light and hope and dissipated the darkness in every corner of the earth.

It took 19 centuries for another light to illuminate the sky in the semidark of early morning in July of 1945. It was in that dreary desert area of New Mexico and the light that illuminated the countryside that morning ushered in the nuclear age and the age of fission. Through it there quickly developed an instrument of destruction that destroyed an estimated 80,000 people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and brought to an end one of the most terrible conflicts ever visited upon mankind.

In this concatenation of events there should be another light. Nineteen centuries ago came the light to generate hope. Then came the nuclear light to bring end to conflict. What we need now is another light in the field of spiritual fission to carry on and through the individual and the fission of that power which lights in the individual spirit to bring reconstruction and good will. It is impossible to believe that the mind which created such a destructive force in 1945 cannot also generate a spiritual force in accord with all Masonic doctrine, which will bring new hope and peace and understanding and brotherhood.

I pray for the day when these things which constitute the living force in the human heart and the human mind can be directed to resolving the problems which beset us today. It will eclipse everything ever achieved at Alamogordo and ever since by the expenditure of billions to perfect and make even more powerful this nuclear force, and that spiritual fission is the very essence of our craft and of the things that I learned in the Blue Lodge long ago.

So, Illustrious Potentate, no matter what the degrees to which we address ourselves, all of us must go back to the foundation truths which we learned in the simplest foundation unit of the fraternity. That is where we get our philosophy. That is where we secure the real drama of truth and that is where these truths are so deeply imbedded in our consciousness to make us proof against all frustrations and disappointments. It will come as it must come in proportion as these basic truths are applied.

You, Illustrious Potentate, have a great responsibility, and I know you will discharge it well. As a humble member of our craft, I shall try to help in my modest way. I thank you. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Thank you very much, Senator DIRKSEN, for those wonderful remarks which will long remain in our minds as coming from one of the most loved and respected men in our Congress.

Now we have with us tonight one of the great Americans, I think, of my generation; I am a little beyond him in years, but I always think of him as being a great American World War I veteran. He has since been a captain of industry. He has served well in whatever he has done and in accord with American tradition. I refer to Captain Eddie Rickenbacker. [Applause.]

Eddie, if you would like to come here and say just a few words, we would be happy to have you. [Applause.]

Capt. EDDIE RICKENBACKER. I think you are wonderful, Al. I think you are wonderful, too. [Patted Imperial Potentate Stringfellow on the shoulder.] I never had the privilege of being associated with so many Communists at one time in all my life. [Laughter.] All I have heard tonight is communism being preached. I am amazed that my good friend—what is his name? He is from Illinois—would think such thoughts. All right, EVERETT.

I am grateful for the privilege, seriously, of being present. I have known George and I have known Al for a great many years. I hope the good Lord will permit me to know them for many more. I am sure that all of us in these trying times, when the fate of our Nation is in balance—regardless of how you may think, it is, and it can go in either direction in the not too distant future—we realize it will depend upon men like you, men that you individually have expressed yourselves about here this evening and your convictions and your courage to follow them, whether we go the right way or whether we go the wrong way.

All of you in my opinion, regardless of your party, are Americans. You are Patrick Henrys, give me liberty or give me death, and that is Americanism. It is the American way of life and I hope when the candle of my life dwindles to the flickering stage that I will be blessed, George, as you are being blessed tonight, with the presence of a group of friends that have no equal. Thank you. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Thank you, Eddie, for your very fine remarks. We all love and respect you.

I was expected to say a few serious things about Masonry and our beloved country.

The essence of Masonry and the Shrine and their purpose and objective is to help good prevail over evil in our actions to exemplify and prove the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. That is all the people of the United States have been trying to do in spending their material resources and sacrificing the finest blood of the Nation the greater part of this century. How wonderful it is that we have men in public office who may have tremendous differences of opinion in connection with the domestic issues, who belong to different political parties, and yet are big enough to realize that the international situation and cold war confronting us requires our complete and undivided attention, and so they are willing to put all these domestic differences in second place and be a harmonious united people in resisting all outside forces that would destroy us and our government of free men.

When the men at Valley Forge were deserting, and George Washington was about as blue as he ever was in his life, Tom Paine went to him and said, "General, may I talk to these men about their desertions?" George Washington said, "Yes, Colonel. If you can say anything to them to stop their desertions, it will be wonderful." Colonel Paine went to them. We could go into great detail. He went to these men who had deserted, and some of whom had come back, and to the ones contemplating desertion because they had empty bellies, ragged clothes, were not being paid, and were in misery. He said this one thing, and I say it to you. He said, "If you desert this great cause and we lose our fight for freedom, I want to ask you, where are you going from there?" Most of the men came back and won our liberty.

And I say to every American that if there ever was a time it is now when a psychiatrist is needed for the well intentioned American people who can't recognize the difference between our great God-given liberty and the misery and suffering of living under a tyrant and a thing like communism,

I just can't understand any people not realizing that we have to give our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor; and everything to preserve our system of human freedom for mankind. Remember, gentlemen, you can't be sorry afterward. It will do no good. You have to take the right action now on time.

I take my hat off to the distinguished majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, in the U.S. Senate, and the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN, who both immediately and without delay, publicly announced that we are a united nation on the Berlin crisis and that they support the stand of our Republican President and his advisers in this crisis. [Applause.] Gentlemen, we must stand together. There is no hope for us if we don't stand together. I know we have differences that are tremendous, but we can solve them if we keep our liberties. If we can't solve them, then our way of life, that I have always loved, is not as strong as I thought it was. But with intelligence, time and cooperation we will find a solution, because time is the balm in Gilead that heals all wounds.

We must find leaders not only with intelligence, but with courage and leaders who realize that we all get our true source of power from God Almighty, as Abraham Lincoln did. That reminds me of a little story about him. When he was about to sign the Emancipation Proclamation, a group of powerful clergymen called on him and told him he was making a serious mistake. The reason they were sure was that they were men of the cloth and on their knees asking guidance from God. Lincoln replied, "I have no doubt about your sincerity in asking me not to sign the Emancipation Proclamation but, gentlemen, I am likewise on my knees several times each day asking God for guidance. If there is a God, and I certainly believe there is one, then He knows I am President of the United States and you are not, and if He has any guidance to give, He will give it to me and not to you. Thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

Few people have ever expressed more succinctly and clearly the danger surrounding a government or state of free people in this world than did Lord Byron when he said, "A thousand years scarce serve to form a state; an hour may lay it in the dust." I think it is one of the choice statements of all time. How true this is and how certainly history records nation after nation where people toiled for centuries to create a state, and then a single mistake laid it in the dust. Let us not make that mistake. There is no use in our discussing for the moment what mistakes we have made by overplaying the hand of charity, consideration, and generosity, because right now the big thing before us is to win the cold war without spending the Nation into bankruptcy. I repeat that. To win the cold war without spending the Nation into bankruptcy. We can do it if we will to do it, and if we are willing to pay the price to preserve liberty and opportunity—the most precious things in life. I say we can do it if we will to do it; by that I mean if we have faith in ourselves.

Here I give you John Freeman Clark's classic definition of faith, and I think it is one of the choice definitions of all time.

"All the strength and force of man comes from his faith in things unseen. He who believes is strong. He who doubts is weak. Strong convictions precede great actions. The man strongly possessed of an idea is the master of all who are uncertain or wavering. Clear, deep, living convictions rule the world."

Masonry means to me the resolution to observe, so far as possible, the Commandments of God in our dealings with our fellow man. It means the recognition of the brotherhood of man. It means the reaching out of a helping hand when one is down and needs our help and one is in a position to give that

help. It does not mean the carrying of one's burdens who is able to carry his own, but in the case of the Masons it means help to those in distress, and in the case of the Shriners it means to supply aid to the crippled children in the hope that it will bring to them some of the enjoyments of life. It means the invoking of the Golden Rule which is the foundation of all equity. Take any rule of equity and you will find it in the Golden Rule.

After watching for 65 years of my 80 years of life, and noting the trends of people's efforts, I believe unless we can put back into first place in our lives as a free people the building of character and maintenance of moral standards, and take the mad race for money, place, and power out of first place, and put it in second place where it belongs regardless of its importance, then, in my opinion, we are doomed to follow the course of other great nations which have become leaders of the world only to lose their power and disappear on the horizon of history. The time of life is brief at best. The objective should be to help good predominate over and destroy evil, thus adding to the improvement of the quality of man and civilization.

I salute you chosen representatives of the people and our public officials and the imperial potentate and the members of our Masonic order and Shrine, and I hope, in the words of George Washington, the Father of our country, that inasmuch as you are on guard in a critical situation facing our beloved country you will, none of you, be found wanting in the wisdom, fidelity, and courage which may be necessary to do your duty at this difficult time. One of the finest things Robert E. Lee ever said is in nine words, "Duty is the sublimest word in the English language." Let that sublimest word be emblazoned in the hearts and minds and souls of all Americans. Let us remember when bad men join hands to destroy the inalienable rights of men under God those of good intent and purpose must unite and pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in support of good and the destruction of evil. Unless we do that, the lamp of liberty and opportunity will be temporarily extinguished. Let us all answer that evil shall not prevail. [Applause.]

After all—I would leave this admonition with this group and every American group—our national character can be no greater than the composite of the individual character of our citizens. This leads to the conclusion that our biggest job is to get hold of ourselves and see that we each are doing our duty; that we each are making our contribution in such a way as not only to save all the fundamentals in the American system and way of life, but to improve those things which need improvement, at a rate of speed which will not destroy the house while we are making the repairs.

This is the need of the Nation; this is your need; this is the need of your family; and this, if carried into effect, will write a page on history which you will be proud to have posterity read.

In closing, let us ask God to give us the patience to accept those things which we cannot change; the courage to change, when we can, those things requiring change; and the wisdom to know the difference.

Now, gentlemen, I have the honor and privilege to introduce to you the potentate of Crescent Temple at Trenton, N.J. I was amazed to find that a man who has accomplished as much as he has is still under 40 years of age. He is a man worthy of the best there is in Masonry and the Shrine. He served his country in the war. He came out with honors and the oak-leaf cluster and a Bronze Star. He is at the head of many organizations, and the thing I like best about him is that his biography shows as fine advancement of a young man as I have ever seen, and yet he sent it to me and said: "Dear

Senator: These are some of the things in my biography. Use them all or none. Either way will be perfectly agreeable to me." That is why he has done a job, gentlemen, because he hasn't wasted his time looking for praise.

I want to tell you that this young man has been elevated to the honor of 33d-degree Mason. Without more ado, Lee, I am proud to introduce you. [Applause.]

Noble LEE WILEY. Thank you, Senator Hawkes and imperial sir.

It seems almost like carrying coals to Newcastle for me to speak after so many fine and distinguished speakers, but I do want to say a few words about a very good friend of ours. It is a great honor for me, as potentate of Crescent Temple, the 10th-largest temple in Shrinedom, to greet you and to extend to you the best wishes of our temple. With over 11,400 members, including such dignitaries as our good friend Senator Hawkes here, Norman Vincent Peale, and our imperial chaplain, Dan Poling, we feel that we enjoy a very enviable position.

But lately we have had one more jewel added to our crown. A member of Crescent Temple is our imperial potentate. We are proud that we can number among our nobility a person such as George Edward Stringfellow. That he is imperial potentate is only part of the story. You know many aspire and reach high positions, but most of the time they are done with cruelty and selfishness and they add little but tarnish to the world in which they live. Fortunately, there are men, like George Stringfellow, who are lifted up by the willing hands of their friends to high positions who remove the tarnish and add new luster.

There are many things about our genial Virginia gentleman that cause men to look up to him and respect him. I heard someone talking about our Virginia man here but actually we consider him a New Jerseyite and we have adopted him as such and I hope he has adopted us.

I think the things you think of when you refer to George can be best summed up in two little words, "He cares." He cares about others. In the Shrine we all know his extraordinary interest in our Shrine hospitals but beyond that his care for disabled veterans in the New Jersey Home for Disabled Veterans is also well known. He has cared that Protestants, Catholics, and Jews should know, understand, and respect one another. He has cared that there be better understanding between labor and management. He has cared for the health of others with his great work in the American Cancer Society. And he cares that this great country of ours should maintain its wonderful way of life. In any and every field of endeavor he has and is showing that he cares. Moreover and most important, he backs his care and concern with positive action.

It so happens that I am a president of the Rotary Club of Trenton and unfortunately I have found one flaw in George's character. He is a Kiwanian. And shame of shames, he has even been president of the New York Kiwanis Club for two terms. One credit I can give to Kiwanis, when they finally found a good man, they knew it.

But seriously, may I quote to you something written by Louis Austin in "This I Believe":

"Our Maker gave us two hands, one to hold to Him, the other to our fellow man. If our hands are full of—or struggling for—possessions, we can hold to neither God nor humanity. If, however, we hold fast to Him who gave us life, who is our ever-present Partner, His loving Spirit will flow through us and out to our neighbor. That is the way of joy, love, achievement, and inner peace."

This then is the way of George Stringfellow, with one hand in God's hand and the other for his fellow man, he walks his quiet way, serving others unselfishly in countless ways because he cares. Thank you. [Applause.]

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES. Thank you, Potentate Lee Wiley, for those stimulating remarks.

Gentlemen, it looks as though we are going to get under the wire in the time I agreed upon. I want to introduce our distinguished guest in a few moments, but I do want to thank the quartet from Crescent Temple for the fine songs and music they have given us.

May I say to you that we are not going to have any benediction because the beloved Chaplain of the House, Dr. Bernard Braskamp, is in the hospital tonight, and so is our distinguished and beloved chaplain of the Shrine, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, in the hospital for a very major operation. We wish them both speedy and complete recovery. We are going to ask our quartet, which rendered such beautiful service tonight, to close the meeting after the imperial potentate speaks, with the song "I Believe," which is a benediction in itself.

Now we come to my very dear friend, George Stringfellow, who is a regular human being. He has virtues and faults like all of us, but his virtues strongly predominate. He has done a wonderful service in the world. I have watched George for a great many years. I could take your time by introducing him with the words in the biography I sent to all of you, but a man who has really done things for his fellow men to a great extent doesn't need much eulogy, even from a friend.

You know, George, when I think of you I think that you were born in a wonderful State, Virginia. My great friend, HARRY BYRD, has represented that State for many years, and he and I have had a relationship for many years that very few men have had in this world.

You gained your educational experience, as I did, in the school of hard knocks. You graduated from what my friends call "Knocks College." You have rendered great service to the free enterprise system. You have rendered great service to your fellow men, not only through the Shrine, but through every department in business and as a member of the Cancer Society, Tax Payers Association, on the board of trustees and directors of several colleges and churches, and other institutions of note.

I was thinking of you this afternoon, George, and the story they told me out in California about Sam Goldwyn. You went up to see Thomas Edison. Most everybody thought you wouldn't make much impression, but you did because you were honest and had the courage to criticize things, and he liked you because you had that honesty and courage and ability. Out in California this young fellow wanted to see Mr. Goldwyn, and tried to get to his office but never could. Finally he got a very influential man to make an appointment. This man took him down to the office and Sam said, "I will give the young man 10 minutes and that is all." Well, the young man went in and the older man stayed outside waiting for him. He waited more than an hour. Finally the door opened and the young man and Sam came out. Sam patted him on the back and said, "I hope to see you again." So the old gentleman and the young man started down the walk. Sam had two or three vice presidents sitting on the porch. He said, "You see that young man going down there?" They said to him, "Yes, Mr. Goldwyn." He said, "That young man is a genius; and smart, too." [Laughter.] And that is what Edison said. You are a genius; and smart, too.

George, we love you for what you understand about humanity. We love you because you have that faculty that Henry Drummond spoke about in his wonderful sermon called *The Greatest Thing in the World*, Love. He said, "In my opinion, on the Resurrection Day, when all souls appear before their Maker for judgment, the great question will not be so much have you vio-

lated the Commandments, but what have you done to help your fellow man? When it has been your privilege to reach out a helping hand to someone who has fallen and needs help to stand on his own feet again, have you given that hand and given that help?" Sir George, this group knows you have.

Now with those few remarks, Mr. Imperial Potentate, and my very dear friend of many years, who bled and almost died with me when I ran for the Senate, I present you to this audience. [Standing applause.]

Imperial Potentate Sir GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW. Senator Hawkes, Mr. Justice Clark, Senators, Congressmen, and other distinguished guests, I bring to you the greetings and the good wishes of the board of trustees of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children, and I bring to you the good wishes and the greetings of the 830,000 Shriners of North America, which I have the privilege to represent.

I thank you sincerely for your most complimentary introduction and I certainly thank you for the warmth of your reception. You have made me feel at home in this Nation's Capital where I had the privilege of spending my childhood. I am deeply grateful to my good friend, the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes, who has served the people of this Republic in many ways, always effectively and always with integrity. It is through his generosity and it is through his desire to promote our way of life that he has assembled here tonight a great group of citizens who have, to a large extent, in the palm of their hand our way of life. I have yet to address a group of citizens who have a greater influence and, therefore, a greater responsibility than those of you who are assembled here tonight. For there is in your hands peace with honor, and there is in your hands the right to declare war to preserve our honor.

Our forefathers gave us our way of life, but it wasn't without cost that they labored and many of them gave their blood and their lives that we might live in liberty. The question that should be in the mind of every American is this: Are we worthy of our heritage? And if we are worthy of our heritage, we will all stand up and be counted. I know of no man who has ever taken the obligations of Masonry and who has implemented those obligations in his daily life who is not worthy of our heritage.

I should like to point out that I have felt for a long time that the 4 million Freemasons in the United States have a greater responsibility to keep America American than any other group of citizens, for the reason that our way of life to a large extent was born in the atmosphere of Masonic lodges. It is a historic fact that a majority of those who signed the Declaration of Independence, and a majority of those who signed the Constitution of the United States were Masons—more than any other group. Therefore, if we are worthy of our heritage, if we live up to our obligations, we will stand courageously for what is right and be counted. The time has arrived in America when we must stand for principle, or we will fall for everything.

Now, the Shrine is a great organization, for it incorporates into its membership only those men who have been thrice tested and approved by their fellow men. First, they must pass the rigid requirements of honor, integrity and brotherhood of the Blue Lodge of Freemasonry. Then they must pass the additional tests to enter into the realm of either the Scottish or York rites of Freemasonry. And of course, finally, they must be accepted once again by those who already have passed the tests of the Shrine. And I say to you that nowhere in the world does the spirit of brotherly love, honor, integrity, charity, and freedom of man beat stronger than in this organization which it is my privilege to head this year.

Since I was elected to this office last July, I have traveled up and down and across this

Nation, visiting the temples of this order. I have talked with the officers of the temples. I have talked with the nobility. I have talked with many of the grand masters and the heads of other Masonic orders. And wherever I have gone, there has come to me the plea that I speak forth in the name of the Shrine for a more militant Masonry, a militancy that in some manner must restore—or help to restore—those freedoms for which Masons sacrificed so dearly.

I cannot and do not, however, speak for Masonry or the Shrine in their attitude toward political philosophy. But I can speak to you as a Mason and as a Shriner on what I have learned to be their moral philosophy as it may be applied to the world we live in.

Freemasonry is the oldest secret fraternity in the world, and it is predicated on the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man and the dignity of the individual. Freemasonry is therefore outlawed whenever dictators seize control. The lamp of liberty burns low today throughout the world. Two out of every five of the citizens of the world are directly or indirectly under the heel of communism. And if communism in any form or by any other name should come to this Nation, you may be assured that the first group to know its venom will be the Freemasons, for the dearest tenet of Masonic thought is freedom. And by freedom, I mean the right to do what we want to do so long as what we do does no harm to the brotherhood of man. And we can lose that freedom, not only to an invading horde from the Kremlin, but also to Americans who may have succumbed to the mysterious drug of power, and through that power maintain control over their fellow men.

Our brother Masons who helped to found this Nation foresaw such a calamity and they sought to protect the future liberty of the people against the machinations of such power-mad people. Our Constitution, as originally written and with the addition of the Bill of Rights, was, as Gladstone said, the greatest instrument ever conceived by the minds of men. And why? Because, my brethren, such men as Washington, Franklin, Revere, Hancock, Madison, Henry, the Lees, and hundreds of others, had learned at the altars of Masonry the holy tenet of freedom.

Washington once said that "the Masonic lessons I learned on my admission to Masonry and my contact in conversation with prominent Masons thereafter were of great encouragement in after years when I encountered and was under severe trials, especially those of the commencement and during the Revolution." He continued by saying that "There is no doubt in my mind that Masonry and its lessons were helpful throughout the Revolution both on the battlefield and in the legislative halls."

In further reference to Masonry, Washington, who became master of his lodge said: "Friendly counsel reached my ears that some of the men regarded me as an aristocrat. I decided to dispel such thoughts from my comrades' minds and on one occasion, I sat in a Masonic lodge in Cambridge in which an orderly sergeant was the master. I made it a point to meet upon the level—and that means much to every Mason—and part upon the square with all my comrades regardless of rank and regardless of position. My reward was the loyalty and friendship of all far beyond my expectations."

We citizens today, in my opinion, can do no better than to emulate our Founding Fathers, who did so much to bring us freedom. Freedom is our greatest asset, but freedom must be earned anew by each succeeding generation, if in fact it is to be retained. Freedom is not something that can be taken for granted. Freedom is not free. Freedom is costly, but slavery is more costly. Freedom can be crushed by treachery from within as well as from without. Freedom can be weakened and finally destroyed by apathy of the people; and many of you in public

life have witnessed in the last few years apathy to a degree that has been serious.

Many of us today are confused by the complexities of life. We sometimes think that if we could get back to the simplicity of life as Jesus knew it in the quiet hill country and by the shores of Galilee, that life indeed would be easy, but I would remind you that life in Palestine 2,000 years ago was neither serene nor simple. Confusion and strife then, as now, was suffered by the people. Tyranny then, as now, existed.

Our Constitution in its wisdom specifically begins the Bill of Rights by saying "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." There was a reason. The people had just fought a war for independence from one tyrannical government, and wanted no other from those among them who might wish to resort to tyranny. The Constitution also says that: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." And listen to the ninth amendment: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Despite these statements, and over the protests of many citizens of this land, ever so gradually, but nevertheless surely, the power of Government has been and is being transferred to an oligarchy, controlled from Washington, the extent of which no one knows.

Woodrow Wilson pointed out many years ago that freedom never comes from the government, but rather from the subjects of government. It is a fact that as government grows larger, it grows away from the people. To preserve themselves in office, elective or appointive, some of our officials kneel down, bow their heads and do the will of those sections of our society which control the vote or have been organized by power-hungry individuals for their own aggrandizement.

Those of you who have studied the history of this Nation must be aware of the drift to socialism that began in the middle of the 19th century and is moving ever more rapidly as each year passes. You say this isn't true? That there is no such thing as socialism in America? Consider, my friends and brethren: The Government operates the biggest business in the world. It is in competition—direct competition—with taxpaying electric companies. It owns the nuclear program. It owns farms and forests. The Government forces participation for most of the citizens in various insurance programs. Is

there freedom of the individual if he is forced to take insurance that may not be wanted or needed? Is it freedom that we are forced to collect taxes from our fellow men so that the fuzzy minds may redistribute to less qualified but more expediently important voters, the rewards of our sweat?

My brethren, the great American experiment of 1787 has been almost lost because there are too few great American leaders like Washington and Randolph and Calhoun who will raise their voices to tell the truth that equalization is against all the laws of nature; leaders unafraid of the jibes and taunts of those who by political chicanery have reached positions of affluence; great leaders who put their intellectual integrity above the cries of those who seek and promise something for nothing. [Applause.]

Alexander Pope says, "Order is heaven's first law; and this confessed, some are and must be greater than the rest. More rich, more wise, but who infers from hence that such are happier shocks all common sense. Condition—circumstance, is not the thing; bliss is the same in subject or in king." There is no socialism in God's plan for life.

The answers to all of these conflicts in my opinion, is the application of the principles of Freemasonry so ably set forth by the junior U.S. Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois a few moments ago. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is what is needed in the world today. Spiritual light is needed today behind the Iron Curtain and in our own Nation. We must by our conduct and example create a moral climate which will sustain free institutions.

We were very fortunate in the early days of our history when we had a small group of leaders whose like had not been seen before, and I regret to say, not enough of them have been seen since. We who love our country are justly thrilled by the courage of our Founding Fathers. They had granite in their character, and they had iron in their background. Individual enterprise, courage, daring, and incentive were the order of the day. Individual freedom and dignity of the individual were uppermost in their minds. Patrick Henry's declaration that "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death" represented the atmosphere in which our way of life was born. And if we are to be worthy of our heritage, and if we are to continue to enjoy our liberties, we must recreate that atmosphere. You know, there is something greater than life—our fathers told us what it was—and that is liberty. If we are to save our country and make our contribution to the peace of the world, we must emulate St. Paul, who, finding that the days were evil, labored to improve them. We

must not follow Hamlet, who cried that the days were evil and cursed them. Nor should we forget William Penn's assertion, when in his wisdom he said, "People who are not governed by God, will be ruled by tyrants." Penn's statement has been true from Herod to Hitler. Our way of life and our fraternity are held together by a spiritual thread the Communists would sever. I believe in the traditions of America established by Washington, the Master Mason. I believe that unless and until we return to the principles of Washington and those other great men who gave us our heritage, we will lose it and will be unable to perform our duty to pass it on to our children.

More than 2,000 years ago, Confucius said, "With righteousness in the heart, there will be beauty in the character. With beauty in the character, there will be harmony in the home. With harmony in the home, there will be order in the Nation. With order in the Nation, there will be peace in the world." [Applause.]

Every Shriner, whether he knows it or not, subscribes to that proverb. I submit there is no group of men in the world which is more interested in producing a righteous peace—a peace with honor—than the Free Masons and the Shriners. They are interested in freedom, justice, and happiness, for all men and women, regardless of color, race, or creed.

We cannot compromise with principle, for whenever we compromise with principle, we lose honor and liberty. Often the temptation to compromise is great, but the reward is always the same—heartaches and tears.

Alexander Pope, in his "Essay on Man," said these few meaningful words regarding compromise with principle—"What then is the reward of virtue—bread? What nothing earthly gives or can bestow, the soul's calm sunshine and the heartfelt joy—is virtue's prize."

I am sure if we keep faith with the vows we took in Masonry and in the Shrine, our conduct will be helpful in building a better world for all. "So mote it be." Thank you. [Applause.]

(The quartet of Crescent Temple sang "I Believe" as the benediction.)

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES, Gentlemen, I want to thank all of you for coming here. I hope that some good has come from this meeting. It is fine for me to be back here with so many of my friends and meet some new friends. I am going to try to bring together once a year as many of the Masons and Shriners in Congress and the executive and judicial branches of the Government as care to join together in the hope it may be beneficial for us all. "So mote it be." [Applause.]

(Adjournment at 10:40 p.m.)

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1959

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God: Immersed and enmeshed as we are in the baffling perplexities which vex the world of human relationships, in this daily quiet moment when we blot out all but Thee, we face our greatest problem—ourselves. In the stillness, as all other voices are hushed, we would face the paramount question of Thy Holy Word—"For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world"—much less the

pitifully small part of it we commonly do gain—"and lose his own soul?"

Help us to see that either here or hereafter our souls are our best and our most abiding selves, and that we lose them in whatever makes us less or other than we should become.

Save us, we beseech Thee, from the supreme futility of grasping for the world and finding at last that powers rich in promise are dwarfed or blasted.

To Thy will may all our potentialities and passions be harnessed, as we give to the world the best we have, knowing that then the best will come back to us and, through us, will help heal earth's open sores.

We ask this in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 21, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER RE-ORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1958—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message